

## ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS WHEN PAID IN ADVANCE.

*Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter*, 52s., including double numbers and postage.  
*Solicitors' Journal*, town, 26s.; country, 28s.

## The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MAY 28, 1864.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE of the House of Commons on the Present System of Registration of County Voters in England have made their report. They have examined a great number of witnesses, and obtained, of course, widely different opinions; but on some points the evidence appears to be tolerably unanimous. All the witnesses agree that the registers are at once impure and defective, and the process of rectifying them frequently attended with annoyance and expense to individuals. There appears to be little difficulty in getting your name placed on the register, whether qualified or not; while, on the other hand, once there, no matter how undeniable your right, you are liable to be annually called upon to substantiate it, and objections are systematically ventured on the chance that the voters, or some of them, would rather lose the franchise than be at the trouble and expense of an annual vindication of their claim to it. The majority of the witnesses propose, amongst other things,—1. That every notice of objection given by a registered elector or overseer should specify the grounds of the objection, and that overseers should give notice of objection like any other objector.

2. That any claimant objected to should be at liberty to make a statutory declaration, in support of his right, and that any objector thereupon persisting in his objection should, if he failed, be necessarily subject to costs.

They consider that each ground of objection taken by an objector should be treated as a separate objection; that costs should follow the event, unless the revising barrister in his discretion saw fit to withhold them, or, in a case where several grounds of objection had been taken, some of which succeeded while others failed, to compound the costs.

The report concludes as follows:—

The committee particularly inquired into the possibility of making the registration of county voters less dependent on the care of individuals, or the activity of political agents, and more a subject of official agency. In Scotch and Irish counties, and in boroughs throughout the three kingdoms, registration is a matter of official agency, supplemented and checked by individual action. The nature and variety of the qualifications for the county franchise in England and Wales, depending as it does mainly on title, tenure, and beneficial interest, limit the application of any official system, and render it impossible to dispense with individual action to the same extent as in constituencies in which the franchise depends on more apparent circumstances.

Most of the witnesses have expressed themselves in favour of intrusting the correction of claims and entries in all points not essential to the right to vote to official agents, to whom the claimants and electors should be invited to furnish all requisite information.

WE ARE GIVEN TO UNDERSTAND that Thomas Hughes, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, well known as the author of "Tom Brown's School-days," and one of the leading advocates for trades' unions, has consented to come forward, in conjunction with Mr. Edward Baines, M.P., as candidate for Leeds at the next election.

THE APPOINTMENT OF MR. PHEAR to be a Judge of the Supreme Court of Calcutta, which we notice to-day, though the learned judge is somewhat more junior than any (we believe) of his predecessors in the office, is likely, so far as antecedents go for anything, to prove most satisfactory to all concerned. The learned gentleman graduated at Cambridge in 1847, when he came out sixth wrangler. He was

immediately elected Fellow and Mathematical Lecturer at Clare Hall, and is now one of the Senior Fellows of that college. He was also Senior Moderator for the year 1856, and afterwards University Examiner for the Law Tripos. During the ten years in which he has been in practice at the Bar, he has been steadily, though not startlingly, increasing in reputation and business.

THE FOLLOWING is a copy of the petition for amendment of the bankruptcy law alluded to in our last:—

TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

The humble petition of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association

Sheweth—That your petitioners' association consists of about 800 practising solicitors, and that its objects are to promote the better and more economical administration of the law, and to maintain the rights and increase the usefulness of the profession.

That the alterations that appear to your petitioners to be requisite in order to remove the evils of the present administration in bankruptcy, and to make the Court effective, are as follows:—

1st. To appoint a chief judge of the same rank as the judges of the superior courts, so as to secure uniformity of practice and decisions, and the confidence of the country; such chief judge to supersede the London commissioners, and to be a judge of appeal from the country commissioners.

2nd. To throw upon the registrars the duty of working out all the details in the realization and distribution of the bankrupt's estate (including the granting orders of discharge in cases where the debts are of small amount, but not where they are above a specified amount) with a ready adjournment to the chief judge, either in court or in chambers, similar to the mode in which the chief clerks perform their duties in the Court of Chancery.

3rd. To separate the administration of the estates of small debtors from the administration of the estates of traders and non-traders having *bond fide* assets for distribution, by conducting the business of bankrupts owing debts or having assets of less than a specified amount, in a separate branch of the court, and before a separate set of officers, and in those cases allowing the registrars to grant orders of discharge, subject, of course, to appeal, by way of adjournment, to the chief judge.

4th. To abolish the present system of requiring bankrupts to employ accountants to furnish accounts, and to leave the employment of an accountant, when needed, to the assignees, only requiring the bankrupt to furnish a list of his debts and property.

5th. The Court should have complete power to dispose of all questions of cross claims, or questions with third persons, arising in the course of a bankruptcy, without sending such questions to other courts, as, for example, questions of disputed securities and preferences to creditors, orders of priority, disputed conveyances. This power is exercised by the Court of Chancery in winding-up matters without any inconvenience; but of course this suggestion is based upon the footing that there is to be a chief judge.

6th. The class of bankruptcy offences to be dealt with in granting orders of discharge (see sections 159 & 221 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861) should be enlarged by including, as matters to be taken into consideration, liabilities for damages for breach of promise of marriage, seduction, wilful trespass, assaults, slanders, libels, and other misconduct, also insolvency attributable to misconduct or reckless and groundless litigation.

7th. The law as to trust deeds should be amended by giving to the Court of Bankruptcy complete jurisdiction over those deeds. The Court should have power to maintain those deeds when the terms of them are assented to by a proper majority of the creditors, and found by the Court to be reasonable in a practical, and not in a merely technical sense. The Court should have power to stay all proceedings against the trader by dissenting creditors, and there should be ready access to the court on all disputes in carrying out the provisions of the deed, similar to the voluntary winding-up of companies, subject the supervision of the Court.

The above being a concise statement of the views of your petitioners on the main points in which it appears to them that alteration is required, they respectfully beg to append the following suggestions and remarks in support of their views:—

Your petitioners would propose to assimilate the duties of registrars to those of the chief clerks in chancery, by letting all the routine business be conducted before the registrars, with a ready appeal, by adjournment, on all disputed points, to the judge. The matters thus adjourned to the judge to be heard by him in chambers if attended by solicitors only, or by solicitors on one side and counsel on the other side, but to be adjourned into court if counsel on both sides are to appear. This is the course adopted in the Court of Chancery and Divorce Court, and it is found to work well.

The registrars would call the assignees or their solicitors before them from time to time, and go through the lists of assets, and see that they were being duly realized, and the proceeds paid in, and keep a short minute of the position of each estate, having the assistance of junior clerks. They would, to use a familiar expression, pull the business of the bankruptcy through. This would at once prevent delay and misappropriation. The same system is adopted by the chief clerks under administration summonses and in winding-up matters, very satisfactorily, and with very few adjournments to the judge.

That the present system in regard to balance-sheets should be abolished, as nothing can be worse. At present, the balance-sheet, which is professedly for the guidance of the assignees, is got up by the bankrupt and his own accountant, and, as a necessary consequence, it is invariably framed with a view to gloss over the transactions of the bankrupt, and to mystify and mislead the assignees; and the extent to which it truly or untruly represents the real transactions of the bankrupt is generally in proportion to the respectability of the bankrupt and the accountant he employs. What makes this absurdity greater is, that this accountant, though selected and employed by the bankrupt, is, practically, paid out of the estate; for he is either really paid out of the estate, or the amount of his bill is taken into consideration in granting the bankrupt's allowance. On the part of the assignees, this balance-sheet is never effectively checked, unless the assignees employ an accountant for the purpose.

In a very large proportion of bankruptcies a balance-sheet is quite unnecessary; for the debts due to and from the estate and the property can be ascertained in a few hours from the books, without the aid of an accountant. It is quite exceptional to employ an accountant to close the books of deceased persons whose estates are administered in chancery. In fact, the only real use of a balance-sheet is to enable the Court to form an opinion of the bankrupt's conduct; and if it is to be prepared for this purpose, it should not be prepared by the bankrupt himself or by his accountant.

The bankrupt should furnish the assignees with a list of his debts and assets, the assignees having liberty, with the leave of the registrar, to employ an accountant for the purpose of making any investigation of the books in any case in which the particular circumstances might make it desirable.

That the jurisdiction with regard to orders of discharge, as well as any penal jurisdiction over fraudulent or reckless debtors, should be exercised by the chief judge alone, except as regards the smaller debtors. But that the registrar should find and state in a summary form in a certificate for the guidance of the Court, at the instance of the assignees and on hearing the debtor, such facts as might be material to enable the Court to form an opinion on the debtor's conduct.

That the trustees under voluntary or private arrangements should have a legal title, similar to that of assignees in bankruptcy, and be able to sue in their own names for choses in action assigned to them, and be entitled (subject always to the control of the Court) by action or suit to undo fraudulent transactions, and recover property improperly made away with, without its being necessary, as now, to resort to bankruptcy for that purpose.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your honourable House will be pleased to take the views and suggestions contained in this petition into consideration, and to refer the same to the select committee appointed to inquire into the working of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

(Signed) { EDWARD F. BURTON, Chairman.  
PHILIP RICKMAN, Secretary.

ON TUESDAY LAST, being the day appointed for the celebration of her Majesty's birthday, there was no sitting in any of the courts of equity. The Queen's birthday is not a regular holiday in the Court of Chancery, but is one of those days which the Lord Chancellor may, if he please, by General Order declare to be so, a

power of which his Lordship on this occasion duly availed himself. The practice introduced at the time of the Revolution with a view of maintaining the independence of the judges precludes the common law courts from paying any respect to these state celebrations, otherwise than by a slight alteration in the robing of the learned judges and Queen's counsel. Their lordships wore their scarlet gowns and full-bottomed wigs. The Queen's counsel also wore their full-bottomed wigs, but they were not in Court dresses, as was invariably the practice until a few years since. There seems to be no good reason, other than the *vis inertia* of our institutions, why this distinction between the common law and equity judges, which extends to many other similar variations of practice, should be any longer preserved. As an instance of such variation, it is the invariable rule that a puisne judge should never be seen at Court after he has once attended to return thanks for his appointment. This rule, introduced to prevent puisne judges from intriguing for the cushions of their courts, does not apply to the Vice-Chancellors, who, we suppose, are presumed to be insensible to the allurements of the woolpack. That such a precaution is no longer needed in either case, can hardly, we think, be matter of doubt.

THE RETURN OF THE HABEAS CORPUS, issued by the Court of Queen's Bench in the matter of the prisoners charged with piracy on the high seas, was argued and disposed of on Tuesday and Wednesday last. The Lord Chief Justice was of opinion that the return was sufficient, but the other three judges differing from his Lordship the prisoners were discharged.

IT IS UNDERSTOOD that the Birkenhead steam-rams intended for the Confederates have been sold to the British Government. This seems to be the most graceful and judicious method which the Government could have adopted under the very difficult circumstances in which they have been placed by the decisions which have taken place in the case of "*The Alexandra*." On the other hand it will extinguish the hopes of those who hoped that the approaching trial at bar before the full Court of Exchequer would have the effect of furnishing the shipowners of this country with an authoritative exposition of the Foreign Enlistment Act which might serve as a guide for the future. The purchase-money, we are informed, is £225,000.

AT A MEETING of the Benchers of the King's Inns, Dublin, on Monday last, Mr. De Moleyns, Q.C., was elected a Benchers, in the room of Mr. Jonathan Henn, Q.C., resigned.

BY THE NEW CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE ACT, just passed, the duty on stock-in-trade under a fire insurance is reduced to 1s. 6d. per £100. The property so insured is to be distinguished in the policy, and in existing policies, by a memorandum thereon. The new duty takes effect on and after June 25th next.

A MEETING of the Department of Jurisprudence and the Amendment of the Law was held at the rooms of the Social Science Association, on Monday evening, Lord Brougham in the chair. A letter was read from Mr. Hadfield, M.P., calling attention to the "*Judgments, &c., Law Amendment Bill*," and requesting the association to assist, by laying evidence on the subject before the select committee of the House of Commons. The bill was referred to the consideration of the standing committee of the department. Mr. Hastings called attention to the Lord Chancellor's bill to amend the County Court Acts. This bill was also referred to the standing committee, to be reported upon at the next meeting of the department. A discussion then took place on a paper read at a previous meeting by Mr. Hastings, proposing a new court of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Lord Brougham, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, M.P., the Common Serjeant, Sir Eardley Wilmot, and other gentlemen, took part in the discussion, in which an unanimous opinion was expressed that

the ecclesiastical courts could not remain in their present condition, and a general agreement was entertained in favour of the views contained in Mr. Hastings' paper. The subject was referred to the committee for further inquiry.

THE CASE OF COLONEL CRAWLEY is likely to be reviewed in the courts of law during the sittings after Trinity term. Sergeant-Major Wakefield, one of the two who were co-prisoners with Lilley, has brought an action against Colonel Crawley for trespass, charging that the arrest was malicious, unfounded, and excessive, and that the superior officers were induced to approve of it by false representations. The damages are laid at £5,000. The defendant pleads "Not guilty" and justification.

THE CONFEDERATE SCREW STEAMER *Georgia*, the vessel which escaped from the Clyde under circumstances which will be fresh in the recollection of our readers, appears to have run her course. Messrs. Curry, Kellock, & Co., shipbrokers, of Liverpool, have been instructed to offer her for sale by private treaty. Her crew has been paid off, and her stores are advertised to be sold by auction on Tuesday next, at Birkenhead. This is probably the first instance in the history of the world of a ship of war which has never during her entire career been within sight of any port of the country to which she belonged.

#### APPEAL IN CRIMINAL CASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

"Why should this bill be necessary?" "Why should not the right of appeal exist, and be as extensive, when a man is tried for his life as when the right to property of the value of £10 is in dispute?" This would perhaps appear a strong objection to the administration of our criminal law, to remedy which this bill has been brought in, and it might seem strange that among all our legal reformers of the last half century, no one has been found up to the present time to supply the alleged defect in our criminal jurisprudence. A prisoner accused of a crime for which the punishment is death or lifelong penal servitude, is, it may be said, less protected by our laws than a right of property of an amount or value comparatively insignificant. But a little consideration will, we think, show that this is not so, and that even the name of Sir Fitzroy Kelly is not a sufficient guarantee for the necessity of the changes proposed by his bill.

A criminal trial is mainly an inquiry into evidence whether or not proof has been given to satisfy the minds of twelve men, the equals in position in life of the prisoner, or of a rank but little above his, that he was the doer of the act, which the law condemns as a crime. If time enough be allowed for getting together the evidence, if a fair and public trial be provided, and if the jury give a conscientious verdict according to their oaths, justice is as likely to be correctly administered in such cases, by means of a single trial, as, making due allowance for the imperfection of all human systems, can be expected. The fact that, so few just complaints are made against judgments in criminal trials is a strong argument for the sufficiency of the present procedure. But not only is the criminal law of England and Ireland so administered as to be above reproach, that administration is surrounded with safeguards which render it almost impossible for it to bear harshly on accused persons. Upon a criminal trial, every fact must be strictly proved against the prisoner; he is entitled to the benefit of every doubt, and in every case in which the punishment, upon conviction, is death or a long period of penal servitude, juries of the present day are unquestionably more likely to stretch a point in favour of the accused than to find him guilty on insufficient proof.

Generally speaking, criminal law is extremely simple, but should difficult questions of law arise, a remedy, and

as we incline to think one quite sufficient, is provided by the Act 11 & 12 Vict. c. 78, to amend which is one of the objects of the present bill. If, on the other hand, the case is one merely of the greater or less weight to be attached to evidence of particular matters of fact, the verdict of the first jury is quite as much to be relied on as that of a second, or even the ultimate result of those of several successive juries. Under the Scotch system, indeed, the verdict of the bare majority which decides in criminal cases, may be open to objection on this ground, but in this country men's lives and liberties may safely be entrusted to the opinion of twelve of their equals, who are at liberty to acquit, unless they are one and all completely satisfied, a privilege of which they avail themselves, at least as much as is commendable.

The advocates of this measure point to the example of foreign countries, and we have frequently heard the French system relied upon as an argument in its favour. It is instructive to note that under that system it has been decided,—first, that there can be no proceeding analogous to motion in arrest of judgment; and secondly, that there is no appeal to the Cour de Cassation on questions of fact; or, as the French court expressed it, that "innocence is not a legal motive for appeal." See the case of M. Lesurques, who was executed, although his innocence was after verdict and before execution clearly established; and who, in this country, would inevitably have been the subject of interposition on the part of the Crown, and thus have escaped scot free.

But supposing the principle of the proposed new law to be free from objection, there would, we conceive, be considerable practical difficulties in its working. In the first place, either we add considerably to the burthen at present borne by the already over-worked staff of judges, or we necessitate the creation of new courts and the appointment of new judges for an end so doubtful, and of which the corresponding gain to the public is so imperfectly made out, that we doubt the propriety of the measure as a tax-payer's question. Again, take the case of acquittals upon appeal: is the man, who has during the interval had to undergo an unmerited imprisonment, to be entitled to compensation or not? If he be not, his case will naturally appear to the public to be one of considerable hardship, and one result of the bill, if it becomes law, will inevitably be the multiplication of petitions to Parliament, similar to those of Mr. Barber and Mr. Bewicke. If he be, the bill should be entitled "An Act for encouraging prisoners to give themselves a second chance at the expense of the public." Thirdly, the alteration in the law which would enable every man who could pay his solicitor to have a second chance while others had but one would afford stronger grounds than ever for the complaint, already of some weight, that there is one law for the rich and another for the poor. Those who are conversant with our criminal courts know, even without the instances of Mr. Bewicke and Mr. Townley, how often poor prisoners are convicted merely because they are undefended, and this hardship, real as it is, will assuredly not be lightened by the proposed change.

A few words with reference to the enactment contained in the 15th section of the bill. It is thereby provided that "it shall be lawful for any of the Courts at Westminster or any judge of the said courts to order that any indictment found at the general or quarter sessions of the peace or at the assizes or at the Central Criminal Court shall be tried by a special jury." Now although we are aware that strong objections may be made to the constitution of common juries and it cannot always be expected that men chosen from the class of the £10 householders shall be Solons or Daniels, and there may occasionally be cases where the intricacy of the evidence, or circumstances of local prejudice, render it desirable to have a class of jurymen of better education and more impartiality; yet these are but few and far between, and do not, we think, furnish sufficient reason for such a total change in our jury system as the above section would introduce.



We think that if the section in question should pass into law, and special juries should in consequence become, as they might, the rule instead of the exception, we should hear more than ever of those recommendations to mercy, arising, not from extenuating circumstances, but simply from a feeling of maudlin sentimentalism, which are already, we believe, far too frequent, and towards which the judges, as we conceive, show far too much complacency. Another reason against altering the present system is, that, as things now stand, the burthen of sitting on juries, which is a very heavy one, is pretty evenly spread over those liable to serve, and we should avoid any change, that, without something stronger to recommend it than we think exists, would throw that burthen so completely on the special jurors' list.

On the whole, while giving to the promoters every credit for integrity of motive, and believing that the bill has been introduced with the sole object of improving our criminal jurisprudence, we cannot think that sufficient cause has been shown for so radical an alteration of the law, and shall be well satisfied with the success of the motion promised by the Attorney-General, to defer the second reading for six months.

## REAL PROPERTY LAW.

### GIFT TO TENANT FOR LIFE'S HEIR.

*Greaves v. Simpson*, V. C. K., 12 W. R. 773.

The two great rules by which limitations of estates in land have, during centuries, been allowed the liberty necessary for the purposes of society, and have been preserved from the extravagances of individual caprice, are the rule against perpetuities, and the rule enunciated by Coke and the other counsel for the defendant in *Shelley's case* (1 Rep. 104a), that when the ancestor, by any gift or conveyance, takes an estate of freehold, and in the same gift or conveyance an estate is limited, either mediately or immediately, to his heirs in fee or tail, always in such cases the heirs are words of limitation of the estate, and not words of purchase. These cases are treated by Fearn as exceptions from his fourth class of contingent remainders—namely, where a remainder is limited to a person not ascertained or not in being at the time when such limitation is made. To this extent, then, the rule in *Shelley's case* simplifies the law of real property. This resulting simplicity is not supposed to have had its origin in any laudable regard for jurisprudence, but to have been established in support of that which supplied the controlling motive in the early frame of English real property law—the lord's feudal benefit. Had the gift to the heirs been construed as a remainder, the lord would have lost the fruits of a descent, while the ancestor, being able either to destroy the contingent remainder or to leave it to take effect, would have scarcely been in a worse position than if he had had the fee. Thus, the resistance of the feudal lord to novelties prejudicial to his old ascertained rights, was indirectly beneficial to the law which regulated the disposition of land.

The application of the rule which guarded against breaking up the fee by the change of a descendant into a purchaser forms the subject of no less than twenty-eight sections in Fearn. The twenty-fifth treats of the case where there is a limitation in the ancestor for his life, and a subsequent limitation to the heir of his body, in the singular number, without words of limitation superadded. With respect to "heir" in the singular number, there is a curious instance mentioned by Coke, in 1 Inst. 22a.: he says, "Of all the estates taile most coerced or restrained, that I finde in our bookes, is the estate taile in 39 Ass. pl. 20, where lands were given to a man and to his wife and to one heire of their bodies lawfully begotten, and to one heire of the body of that heire only." Here there was a limitation superadded. But even, without such addition, a devise to A. for life, remainder to the next heir male,

and for default of such heir male, then to remain, was adjudged an estate tail in him: *Burley's case*, cited by Hale, C.J., 1 Vent. 230. Numerous other cases of a like character are noticed by Fearn in the section to which we are referring.

Distinguished from these cases of "heir," in the singular number, without superadded words of limitation, is *Archer's case*, 1 Rep. 66a., where, according to the judgment, the devise was to Robert Archer, the father, for his life, and afterwards to his next heir male, and to the heirs male of the body of such heir male. It was agreed, by all the judges of the Common Pleas, that Robert Archer had but an estate for life, because he had an express estate for life devised to him, and the remainder was limited to his next heir male in the singular number. The discrepancy between the judgment and the pleadings in *Archer's case* is noticed by the Vice-Chancellor in the principal case. As stated above from the judgment, the superadded limitation was similar to the limitation in remainder upon Robert Archer's life estate, but, according to the pleadings, the devise in remainder was to the "right and next heir of the same Robert Archer, and to the heirs of his body, lawfully begotten, for ever." This is the more worthy of observation, because, in the principal case, an argument was attempted, that, where in the gift in remainder the words of heirship are similar to those in the superadded gift—that is, where both are "heirs male," or "heirs of the body," or "heirs," the heir does not take by purchase, but the inheritance is in the ancestor, to whom the life estate is limited. Preston states the rule thus where the first limitation is to "heirs" (1 Est. 347) (in quoting it we indicate the emphatic type of the original):—"The general rule is, that, although in deeds and wills words of limitation are added to the gift to the heirs, yet IF THE ADDITIONAL WORDS ARE OF THE SAME IMPORT, or, rather, not at variance with the former words of limitation, and are virtually included in and expressed by these words, the words of limitation, as used in the first instance, will, notwithstanding the words of superadded limitation, enlarge the estate of the ancestor, and will vest in him the interest imported by the limitation to his heirs." If this were the general rule as to "heir," it would be decisive of the principal case, in which the devise was in trust for the testator's nephew, John Greaves, for his life, "and from and after the decease of the said John Greaves, then upon trust for the heir or heiress-at-law of the said John Greaves, his or her heirs and assigns for ever." But the Vice-Chancellor, so far from adopting any such rule, considered that the judgment in *Archer's case* was conclusive the other way. It appeared to the Vice-Chancellor that he could not hold, in order to give effect to superadded words, that they should import a different estate than the gift to the first person. If the word first used was the word "heirs," and then, with words of limitation superadded, if the words of limitation imported a different estate from the word "heirs," it was of importance. But when it was in the singular number, with words of limitation added, it was not necessary that the estate imported should be a different estate. As to the intention of the testator, it was hardly possible to arrive at any other conclusion than that the mere gift to a person of an estate for life would not prevent the operation of the rule in *Shelley's case*, if after that there was a gift to the heir or heirs of the body of such person; but here the estate for life being an ingredient in the intention, there was the use of the singular number "heir or heiress-at-law," and superadded words of limitation importing a fee. The testator's intention was clear, and might be carried into effect, and the rule in *Shelley's case* did not interfere. If, indeed, the Court was obliged to decide that the heir took by descent, then the rule in *Shelley's case* would make it a fee simple in the great nephew; but the superadded words prevented that.

Part of the property comprised in the will, and subject to the limitations which we have quoted from it, was personality. The Vice-Chancellor held that after John Greaves' death this part of the property would go the



person answering the description of heir or heiress, not to the next of kin or executor, *secundum naturam rei*; for a man might give personal estate to his heir, and it would be an absolute gift. It was true, with respect to personality, the words "heirs and assigns" were not appropriate words to indicate the devolution of personality. Here they were used as being appropriate to a portion of the property—the real estate; but, although not appropriate to personality, they gave the absolute interest.

Throughout the Vice-Chancellor's judgment we may recognise a disposition not to further the operation of technical rules in opposition to the testator's intention, where that intention is not in itself unlawful, and is not expressed in terms manifestly within the technical rule which would defeat it. Notwithstanding the force of a rule of Preston in any question on the law of real property, it is satisfactory to see blown to the winds a distinction that a gift in remainder upon the ancestor's life estate to the heir, and his heirs and assigns, should give the ancestor the inheritance, and such a gift in remainder to the heir, and his heirs of his body, should give the heir the inheritance. Technicality in law there must be; but every wise judge will distinguish between the technicality which serves the purpose of precision and the technicality which is only another name for a pitfall.

### COMMON LAW.

#### STAMP DUTIES ON DEEDS OF SETTLEMENT.

*Re Alsager's Settlement*, Exch., 12 W. R. 477.

In this case it has been decided that duty is payable on a settlement of foreign bonds at their nominal, and on Indian Stock at their actual, value. The principal question is not, however, now of much practical importance, being, as our readers are aware, met, and intended to be set at rest, by the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, which already has received discussion in our columns.

A subordinate point, however, arose incidentally in the case, which, as it bears generally upon the question of "settlement" stamp duty, we consider worthy of some remark.

The question under argument being what came within the description of "a definite and certain principal sum," the Lord Chief Baron is reported to have inquired of the Attorney-General, "Would an annuity come within the term?" The Attorney-General replied, "There is a separate provision with respect to annuities; they are charged according to their real value, and it is because parliamentary stock is considered as an annuity that it is charged at its real and not its nominal value."

Now, as annuities are very often dealt with in deeds of settlement, it is of importance to understand properly this construction and application of the Acts by the Attorney-General: and, bearing in mind that the whole case turned upon the question as to what kinds of funds and properties were chargeable with stamp duty under the particular head of "settlement," the meaning of the Attorney-General seems to us to have been this—that annuities are chargeable with "settlement *ad valorem* duty on their value. We believe that we are not misrepresenting the hon. and learned gentleman, and, if we have rightly expressed his meaning, we take the liberty, with all possible deference to so distinguished an authority, to dissent from the proposition.

Let there be no mistake about the point at issue: we contend that annuities are *not* chargeable with "settlement" *ad valorem* duty.

Previous to the passing of the 13 & 14 Vict. c. 97, a deed of settlement itself was chargeable with no duty whatever in respect of annuities, no matter in what manner the same might be secured by or dealt with in such deed of settlement; but by the above-named Act, any deed (including a deed of settlement) containing a covenant to pay an annuity exceeding £50 was charged in respect of such

covenant with the like *ad valorem* bond duty as a bond for the like purpose would be chargeable, except, of course, where the annuity was already secured by a bond, &c., on which proper duty had been paid.

It may be said, Is not this a distinction without a difference? Was not the Attorney-General referring to this bond duty when he spoke of "settlement" duty on annuities? Be it so: it would nevertheless still be incorrect to say that such duty is payable on the value of the annuity, either in fact or within the meaning of the stamp laws; it is treated on the footing of a bond debt, and assessed on the amount of the annuity, irrespective of the age of the annuitant, and, therefore, obviously bears no proportion whatever to the true value of the annuity.

This bond duty is that lastly named in the schedule of the 13 & 14 Vict. c. 97, and is still payable, and not proposed to be dealt with by the new Act.

It is of some importance that these distinctions, fine as they may seem, should be borne carefully in mind; because not only the high-handed action of the Inland Revenue Commissioners requires the most skilful and energetic opposition, but the later tendency of the courts, as exemplified in the above case and that of *Attorney-General v. Partington*, which we mentioned last week, seems to be to give the Crown and not the taxpayer the benefit of every option. In this case, where the nominal was greater than the actual value, they assessed the duty on the nominal value; when the reverse was the case, on the actual: in that case, when the Crown had to gain double duties they referred to the time when the administration should have been taken out; when it had to gain increase of duty, to the time when it was so.

### COURTS.

#### COURT OF CHANCERY.

(Before Vice-Chancellor Sir J. STUART.)

May 24.—*Price v. M'Beth*.—This was a motion for an order directing Mr. Wainwright, the taxing master, to review his taxation of the costs of the defendants, Messrs. Prothero & Fox. The bill was filed by a puisne mortgagee for redemption against the mortgagors and Messrs. Prothero & Fox, who were solicitors, and they had acted for themselves in the suit, but they had not been in possession of the mortgaged property. The taxing master had taxed the costs of Messrs. Prothero & Fox on the ordinary scale as between party and party. It was objected by the plaintiff that they should have been allowed "costs out of pocket" merely: the taxing master had disallowed this objection, considering it confined to cases where the solicitor was a trustee or other accounting party, and thereupon, the present motion was made.

Mr. J. Pearson, in support of the motion, contended that a solicitor mortgagee, like a solicitor trustee, when acting on his own behalf, was not entitled to any costs beyond those actually out of pocket.

Mr. Whitbread, for the defendants, Messrs Prothero & Fox, having stated the terms of the decree, was stopped by

The VICE-CHANCELLOR, who said that the question should have been raised at the hearing; and added that he did not intend to decide whether or not a solicitor acting for himself as a mortgagee in a suit for redemption was, as a matter of course, to have his ordinary full costs of suit. That was a question for the Court at the hearing of the cause, and if any reason could be suggested why the solicitor mortgagee's costs should be simply costs out of pocket, the decree should be so direct; but if it did not so direct, the taxing master was bound to proceed in the ordinary way. The motion must, therefore, be refused, but without costs.

May 26.—*Young v. Fernie*.—His Honour gave judgment in this case. He went carefully through the evidence as to the first introduction of the oil into the market. He animatedly stung upon the voluminous evidence which had been offered as to the nature of coals and shales, which he said had failed to produce any serious effect on his mind, and of the unimportance of which he was satisfied.

The validity of the patent had been twice established at law, once in England and once in Scotland. There must be a decree for the plaintiffs, with costs.

A discussion then arose as to damages; which his Honour at first refused, saying that the plaintiffs' right was an account of profits if they thought it worth while to take it.

It was ultimately arranged that the point should stand for argument to an early day.

### COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Commissioner FANE.)

May 20.—*In re Moss*.—The bankrupt, Alfred Raphael Moss, an attorney, of 28, Martin's-lane, Cannon-street, applied for his release from Horse-monger-lane Gaol.

Mr. R. Griffiths opposed.

From the statements made to the Court in opposition, it appeared that the bankrupt, while an uncertificated attorney, conducted certain legal proceedings for Mr. M'Pherson, who was, at that time, a schoolmaster resident at Leatherhead. On behalf of Mr. M'Pherson he received sums of money amounting in the aggregate to £200, £50 of which he paid over to his client, and the balance he retained as against "costs." An action being brought by Mr. M'Pherson for the recovery of the difference the bankrupt consented, upon the eve of trial, to a verdict for £146; the arrest followed.

The bankrupt, in answer to Mr. Griffiths, said that during the years 1861-2-3 he was an uncertificated attorney. The business for Mr. M'Pherson was transacted in the last year. He had made an offer of a composition of 5s. in the pound, which Mr. M'Pherson refused—hence the present bankruptcy.

Mr. Commissioner FANE said that the conduct of the bankrupt had been very vexatious. The Court would not interfere until the bankrupt had been a month longer in custody.

Application refused.

(Before Mr. Commissioner GOULBURN.)

May 23.—*In re Colonel Waugh*.—This case was upon the paper for examination, but, in consequence of the very voluminous accounts not being yet complete, a month's adjournment was taken.

Mr. H. Linklater appeared for the assignees; and Mr. Sargood for the bankrupt.

The claim by the London and Eastern Bank against the bankrupt's estate for £245,000 stands over for argument.

(Before Mr. Registrar ROCHE.)

—*In re William Frederick Windham*.—This was a meeting for choice of assignees under the bankruptcy of Mr. W. F. Windham, coach proprietor, of Cromer, Norfolk, and elsewhere.

Mr. Lawrance appeared on behalf of the petitioning creditor; and Mr. Brough, Mr. Roche, Mr. Chidley, and other gentlemen for creditors.

Various proofs were tendered, some of which were admitted, and others adjourned. Amongst others was a claim by Mr. William Howlett, of the Music-hall, Norwich, for £115, being the price of a grand American square pianoforte sold to the bankrupt.

Mr. Lawrance.—The objection to this proof is that, although the piano was sold to the bankrupt, yet that it has never been delivered to his order. Mr. Howlett is quite ready to give up the pianoforte for the benefit of the estate.

The bankrupt, upon examination, said that he had ordered the piano to be sent to a lady resident in Claverton-street, St. George's-road, Pimlico, but that afterwards Mr. Howlett came to him and said he could not find the lady's address. Mr. Howlett then said that he would retain the piano rather than lose his money, and he (the bankrupt) consented.

The proof was adjourned.

Mr. William Smith, of Norwich, veterinary surgeon, the petitioning creditor, was chosen assignee, Messrs. Lawrance & Co. being the solicitors to the estate.

An application made for an "allowance" was withdrawn, in consequence of a statement by Mr. Roche that the bankrupt was in receipt of £500 per year through Mrs. Windham.

The aggregate debts and liabilities are stated at about £2,000, with assets of considerable value.

(Before Mr. Commissioner HOLROYD.)

May 26.—*In re J. Leete*.—The bankrupt, who was a solicitor of Great Carter-lane, Doctor's-commons, obtained an immediate and unopposed order of discharge.

### BOW STREET POLICE COURT.

(Before Mr. VAUGHAN.)

May 23.—*Unlicensed Madhouses*.—Mr. Welsby appeared on

behalf of the Commissioners in Lunacy to prosecute upon a summons charging Mrs. Sophia Leander, of Zion-house, Turnham-green, for receiving more than two lunatics into that establishment, it not being licensed or registered under the Act for the regulation of the treatment and care of lunatics.

Dr. Thomas B. Christie, superintendent of the Hackney Lunatic Asylum, stated that, in company with Mr. Luttwidge, Commissioner in Lunacy, he had visited Zion-house, where he saw Mrs. Leander. She told him that the establishment was under her management, and that there were about eighty inmates, all women. He examined four or five of them, and found that they were persons of unsound mind.

Mrs. Leander declared with some warmth that she wanted nothing but truth and justice, which she was determined to have.

Mr. Thomas Martin, chief clerk to the Commissioners in Lunacy, deposed that the house had not been duly licensed or registered. Mrs. Leander had not made any regular application in the form required by the rules, but she had expressed her willingness to take out a license, which, however, the commissioners would not grant unless she reduced the number of inmates.

Mr. VAUGHAN observed that it was necessary to give evidence of the approval of the Commissioners in Lunacy.

Mr. William Richardson Spring Rice, secretary to the commissioners, produced the minute directing the prosecution.

Mrs. Leander said that when she commenced the movement which led to the establishment of this asylum she went to the Earl of Shaftesbury and obtained his approval. She had been a district visitor, and knew several families members of which were of weak intellect, but not lunatics or idiots. She thought that it would be for the benefit of society to establish a home for these persons—not an asylum in which they should be treated as lunatics, for that would be offensive to them. A committee of ladies had been formed, and the house opened. After this had gone on for some time, without any interference from the commissioners, the committee had issued an advertisement, offering to receive young ladies. This had brought the commissioners down upon them. She denied that the inmates were lunatics. One only—a girl who was subject to fits—suffered from derangement at the time when the fits were coming on. The others were not insane at all.

Mr. VAUGHAN said that these observations did not affect the present charge. It was clear from the evidence of Dr. Christie that the inmates were lunatics within the meaning of the Act. It would be his duty to send the case for trial.

Mr. Welsby said the commissioners did not think it necessary to ask for heavy bail. It would be sufficient if her husband were bound over in £50 for her attendance to take her trial.

Mrs. Leander said she was willing to be bound over herself, but she would not suffer her husband to be bound for her. She would much rather go to prison than allow her husband to interfere.

Mr. VAUGHAN said that was nonsense.

Shortly afterwards Mr. Leander attended, and entered into recognizances in £50 for the appearance of his wife to take her trial at the Central Criminal Court.

### GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

#### LAW OF DEBTOR AND CREDITOR.

Notice.—We have received a number of communications, some of them of considerable value, on this subject, which we are compelled to pass over, simply because to insert them all would require a much greater space than we have at our disposal. We have, therefore, selected the following letters, not because they enter more fully or accurately into the question than several others, but because they appear to us fairly and tersely to represent that which we gather from the whole correspondence to be the general feeling of the profession on the point.

Sir,—The tendency of legislation seems to be almost entirely in favour of debtors. The present law may be fairly described as "a system of freeing debtors from their liabilities," as in nine cases out of ten the creditor gets nothing more than a nominal dividend; and plaintiffs in county courts (except in a few rare cases against wealthy defendants), find that they have laid out their money in summonses, hearing-fees, &c., without any probability of a substantial benefit from their judgments. What with the nuisance of bills of sale, and the very great difficulty of getting an order of commitment on judgment sum-

mons owing to recent rules of court, an obstinate debtor may, in the vast majority of cases, even now bid defiance to his creditors. How that evil will be increased when the courts are deprived of the only means they now have of enforcing their orders, I leave your readers to judge.

Bad as the present state of the law is, the Lord Chancellor's bill, if it should pass, will make matters worse. I allude particularly to the clause depriving plaintiffs of the right to issue writs in cases under £20, where the defendant resides more than twenty miles off. The privilege now existing puts a stop to much passive fraud (if I may use the expression) on the part of dishonest people who have not such facilities for braving and resisting the process of the superior courts as they have that of the county courts. I will say nothing of the manifest injustice in compelling a plaintiff to go from one end of the kingdom to the other to prove his debt; which, if the bill becomes law, must often be the case, if the debt is to be recovered at all.

The profession should again petition against the objectionable clauses of the measure, and if they show as united a front as they did when Mr. Bouverie led the attack last year, there will be no fear as to the result.

OBSERVER.

Cheltenham, May 19, 1864.

Sir,—The Lord Chancellor, in his smart and clever speech in introducing this bill, referred to certain clauses therein contained to prevent the issuing writs of summons from the superior courts for small sums. My object in now writing to you is to call the immediate attention of all the law societies in the kingdom to the matter.

The bill proposes to enact that if a writ of summons under £20 is issued in a superior court, and even if a judgment be obtained thereon, the defendant may pay the debt without any costs. Attorneys who know best their clients' interests will, I hope, not fail to make as vigorous attack on this part of the bill as they did when Mr. Bouverie brought in a bill to somewhat the same effect two years ago, and with the same success. Let the law societies look well to their members' interests in the matter.

I presume most of your readers will have read for themselves the letter of "A Metropolitan County Court Judge" in the *Times* newspaper of this day on the second section, which proposes to confiscate debts under £20, after a year. I do not consider that this provision concerns us as attorneys much. It is for the mercantile and commercial classes to express themselves upon this point. Indeed, many a solicitor and attorney will be only too glad of an excuse for pressing for payment of sundry small bills of costs at an earlier date than some clients at present seem to care about discharging them.

I particularly wish to call the attention of the profession and the public to the fact that out of sixty county court judges, *but only*, as appears from a return lately presented, are in favour of abrogating the power of imprisonment, while the remaining fifty-eight express clear opinions that any such abrogation would inevitably be productive of most disastrous results.

I should have hoped, and I confess I did suppose until now, that his Lordship had more respect to the practical knowledge of the *Bar* than, when he found that fifty-eight out of sixty county court judges (many of them Q.C.'s and Serjeants) were in favour of the retention of the power of imprisonment as before, to set up his own single unpractical opinion in opposition to them all.

The provisions in the bill, to give a limited equitable jurisdiction to county courts, will, I apprehend, be highly approved of by country solicitors, though hardly so I suppose by town ones, as it must affect the agency houses considerably.

Bristol, May 17.

JOHN MILLER.

## BOOKKEEPING.

Sir,—Your correspondent "Eton," in addition to the book of Mr. Ibbister, will find a little book of questions and answers set at previous examinations, very useful. It is published by Stevens & Co., Bell-yard, price 1s.

STUDENT.

May 23.

## APPOINTMENTS.

Jan. 24.—HENRY STRINGER, of New Romney, in the county of Kent, Gentlemen, to be a commissioner to administer oaths in the High Court of Chancery in England.

May 7.—FREDERICK MERRITWEATHER BURTON, of Gains-

borough, in the county of Lincoln, Gentleman, to be a commissioner to administer oaths in the High Court of Chancery in England.

THOMAS AMAS JENNINGS, of Pickering, Yorkshire, to be a commissioner to administer oaths in the High Court of Chancery.

GEORGE HULME HAWLEY, of Longton, Staffordshire; FREDERICK M. BENTON, of Gainsborough, Lincolnshire; and HENRY STRINGER, of New Romney, Kent, to be commissioners to administer oaths in the High Court of Chancery.

JOHN BUDD PHEAR, Esq., of the Inner Temple and Norfolk Circuit, to be a judge of the High Court of Judicature of Calcutta, *vice* Mr. Justice Mills, deceased.

By the operation of the Act for the despatch of business in the Court of Chancery, the following changes will take place:—Mr. BUCKLEY will succeed to the vacant chief clerkship in Vice-Chancellor Kindersley's chambers, and be succeeded by Mr. HAWKINS as chief clerk at the Rolls; and Mr. CHURCH will take the place of Mr. Whiting at the Rolls.

## PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

## HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, May 23.

## COUNTY COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The LORD CHANCELLOR moved the second reading of this bill.

LORD BROUGHAM said that it could not be overlooked that there was an almost unanimous opinion on the part of the county court judges against the bill. Of the sixty judges, fifty-eight were clearly and decidedly opposed to one of the most important parts—that with reference to imprisonment for debt. Of some parts of the bill he highly approved. He had himself endeavoured to procure an extension of equitable jurisdiction to the county courts, but had not succeeded. He thought that it would be inexpedient to restrict the period within which a small debt was recoverable to one year, and that the period should be extended to two years. On the whole, he approved the object of the bill, but thought it would require amendment in committee.

LORD ST. LEONARDS said that the question lay in a very small compass, although it was one of great social importance. He saw no reason for the reduction of the term of six years to one year; and he was certainly of opinion that the period within which small debts might be recoverable ought not to be less than three years. This was a question of some importance, for credit was capital, and if the credit of the labouring classes was taken away, the only capital they had was taken from them. He thought that their sympathies should not all be on the side of the debtor, for the creditor, the small shopkeeper with a small capital, was entitled to a share of them. As the law at present stood, if a man had means to pay a debt and would not pay it he might be sent to prison; but the bill before the House proposed to take away the power of sending to prison altogether, except in cases of fraud. The bill further proposed a sort of garnishee clause, attaching the accruing wages of the debtor in the hands of his employer for the payment of the debt. How could such a provision be carried into effect? At a late public meeting a manufacturer stated that he employed an enormous number of people, he (Lord St. Leonards) believed some 2,500. Let their Lordships conceive a manufacturer of that description, when his people were unwilling to pay their debts, served with a notice to appropriate a portion of the men's wages for the payment of the creditors, and how did they think the provision would work? This bill might fairly be called "a bill for stopping the credit of the labouring classes." Nothing, he might add, could in his opinion be a greater curse than turning those county courts into courts of equity, and he objected to that portion of the bill which would have that effect, believing that the result of its operation would be to promote litigation throughout the land.

LORD CHELMSFORD said he was most anxious that the question involved in the present bill should not be regarded simply as one of a legal character. It was a social question of the highest importance, and one which involved not only the welfare of the working classes, but their independence and integrity. The leading feature of the latter portion of the bill might be described as a proposal to take away from the judges of county courts the power of imprisoning persons who, having the ability to pay the amount ordered by the court, neglected



or refused to do so. The Royal Commission, appointed in 1863 to inquire into the working of these courts, had carefully abstained from suggesting the removal of this power from the judges. In 1858 all the county court judges had, as far as he remembered, unanimously expressed their opinion as to the desirability of retaining this power of commitment. He would call their attention to what had been said by one of the judges. "A great fact in reference to this question of imprisonment has been sadly overlooked by persons generally. No man is, or ought at all events in accordance with law to be, imprisoned simply because he has money and does not comply with the order of the court, but because the judge is satisfied by evidence that he is able to comply with the order and obstinately refuses so to do." Under the old law, imprisonment for debt was enforced whether the debtor had the means of paying or not; but in the county court the power was only exercised where the debtor had the ability to pay, and refused to do so. He wished to call their Lordships' attention to a remarkable case. A defendant, summoned for the price of a bottle of whisky, admitted that he had purchased and drank it, adding that it was very good, but set up as a defence the Tippling Act, passed in the reign of George II. The judge, pretending to have heard of this Act for the first time, looked at it very carefully, and then said, "I cannot order you to pay for the whisky, but, of course, you returned the bottle?" "No," said the defendant, "I did not." "Well, then," said the judge, "I find nothing in the Act with regard to bottles, and therefore I shall award 3d. for the bottle, 7s. 6d. for the costs of the poor man whom you have compelled to attend here to-day, and 2s. 6d. for his witness." The defendant did not resist payment of the sums ordered, but if he had he was sure that not one of their Lordships would deny that he ought to have been sent to prison, even for so small a sum as 3d. The fact was, the smaller the sum the more reason there was for assuming that the debtor must have the means of paying it, and that therefore his imprisonment was due to his own obstinacy, and not to the oppressive character of the system. The noble and learned Lord's object in introducing this bill was to put an end to mischievous facilities for obtaining credit by the labouring classes, and, in illustration of the evils of the present system, he read two passages from the answers of county court judges relating to tallymen and Scotch pedlars. After reading those passages the noble and learned Lord had said that was the nature of the cases which arise under the present law. He hoped his noble and learned friend would not give the sanction of his high authority to an opinion that any liability could arise in such cases as those referred to. In one case credit was given to a daughter without the knowledge of her father and mother, and in the other case credit was given to a wife for useless finery without the knowledge of her husband. He ventured to say that any county court judge who committed a father or husband under such circumstances would not understand his duty nor be administering the law. He was informed that county court judges almost invariably refused to make a husband liable for articles ordered by the wife unless they were of absolute necessity, and in the majority of cases the judges refused to make a man liable unless his signature was to be found in the tallyman's book. With regard to the 2nd section of the bill, he admitted it would be desirable that a general measure were introduced, not altering the law in regard to the Statute of Limitations, except by abridging the period within which action might be brought. But he did not see the ground on which a distinction was to be drawn between debts above and those under £20. Another proposal, which was exceedingly plausible, but to which strong objections might likewise be urged, was that for taking away the concurrent jurisdiction of the superior courts in cases under £20. In a variety of cases, debts of £20 were incurred, not by labourers and mechanics to artisans and tallymen, but by retail shopkeepers to wholesale merchants and warehousemen. To take away in such instances the jurisdiction of the superior courts, which generally proved effective, and to compel the London, Glasgow, or Manchester merchant to send his travellers and books to follow those county courts all over the country, would be a very serious hardship, and anything but a saving of expense. The debtor, moreover, would have a direct inducement to carry the matter into the county courts, as thereby he would obtain a little longer time, with the ultimate chance of being allowed to pay off the debt by instalments. The effect of passing such a measure into law would be to put a stop to this class of credits altogether, and, to that extent, to destroy the operations of trade.

Lord LYVEDEN was anxious to view the proposition in its

social bearing, the debate up to that moment having been conducted exclusively by noble and learned lords. To the agricultural districts no greater boon could be offered than the abolition of the pernicious system of credit by which they were at present weighed down, and the noble and learned lord on the woolsack, if he relieved them from this great embarrassment, would entitle himself to their lasting gratitude. It was the credit system which was directly responsible for all the frauds practised on the poor, the rotten garments sold for them to wear, and the miserable food palmed off for them to eat. They felt themselves dependent on the tradesmen, and went on running into debt with them to an amount greater than their circumstances warranted, under the belief that if they gave their creditors cause for offence they could be sent to prison.

Lord CRANWORTH said he approved the material features of the bill, and especially of those clauses which limited in a great degree the power of imprisonment. Credit no doubt was important in the mercantile world among those who had transactions abroad, among manufacturers, and among wholesale and even retail dealers; but what imaginable advantage was there in a system of credit among the poorer classes? If the sole object of legislation was to enable small traders to recover debts of £1 or £2, he did not believe that any means could be devised that would be half so effectual as the power of commitment to prison. But, in a social point of view, it was better to go further back and consider whether these debts ought to be recoverable at all. He had not said that small debts ought to be regarded as debts of honour, but that they should be no more recoverable at law than debts of honour. Such a principle, if established, would, he believed, be for the advantage of society. Meanwhile he should give his cordial assent to the second reading of this bill.

The LORD CHANCELLOR feared that the legislation of Parliament had been in a great degree the cause of much demoralization, and that the system of credit that had grown up under the County Courts Acts had been a very great social evil. There were two or three positions which the opponents of this measure took for granted, but which he could by no means admit. The first was that it was good and expedient in the interest of the poor man that he should retain the facilities of credit he now enjoyed. But these facilities of credit were a constant temptation to the labouring man to live beyond his means and to make him familiar with the inside of a prison. The second was that the creditor had a moral right to imprison a debtor until he had obtained payment of his debt. This he denied *in toto*. When the creditor came to him to ask for the imprisonment of his debtor he thought he had a right to ask him under what circumstances he had given him credit. It was the creditor who was able to undergo a searching examination on this point satisfactorily to whom he should alone be willing to give the power of pursuing the debtor to a prison. Another argument against his bill was, that a debtor who owed £10 or £20 stood on the same footing as the man who owed £500 or £1,000. What distinguished the case of a poor debtor from that of a rich debtor was, that the poor debtor was compelled to mortgage the labour of his hands for ever until he had satisfied the debt, and the law called his future earnings "ability to pay." He would trouble their Lordships with one more illustration in regard to the case of the tallymen. In the first place, however, he wished to say that he did not mean to be indiscriminate in his remarks. Some of these men, no doubt, were perfectly free from the blame he had attached to others of them: but the system existed as he had described it. After speaking of the tallymen, the same county court judge from whom he had already quoted proceeded to say:—"So much in justice to the men. Of their system of trading, however, I must speak very differently. The enormous number of poor men that it brings before the county court is its simplest and most evident condemnation. I have known an instance where a single hawker has taken out more than fifty summonses from one court for the same day of hearing. They make the court their 'debt collector,' thereby saving themselves the trouble of going for the fortnightly or monthly sixpence or one shilling to the poor man's cottage. And then, what has been so often objected to the system, their visit is usually made when the husband or father is absent at his work." It was not the case, as their Lordships had been told, that a husband or father was liable to pay only when he had consented to the order being given. If a dealer left goods in a house, although without the knowledge of the master, and those goods were used and worn by the wife or daughter, the man became liable, notwithstanding he was no party to the ordering of them. A recent number of the *Solicitors' Journal* gave a long list of

cases decided in one day in a county court, when, although it was proved that in many instances the goods had been left during the absence of the master of the house, and in some even without the consent of the wife, defendant after defendant was ordered to pay the debt with costs. There could be no doubt whatever that the law as it now existed was a source of much mischief, and it was an idle attempt to defend it on the ground that imprisonment was necessary for the recovery of debts. Under the existing system, not only was the poor debtor demoralized, but his family were pauperized, and heavy burdens were thrown upon the public. The noble and learned Lord concluded by expressing his desire that all the details of the bill should be patiently and anxiously investigated in committee.

The Earl of DERBY remarked that the noble and learned Lord had directed his observations mainly to the encouragement now given to reckless credit, which previously led to imprisonment. Imprisonment was at present limited to cases where the creditor was not reckless in giving credit. He had heard of a man coming before a county court judge, not disputing the debt, but setting the law at defiance by a refusal to pay, while all the time he was chinking the money in his pocket. The noble and learned Lord had proposed an attachment for the wages, which was open to the objection that, as the employer would certainly not take upon himself to satisfy all these small demands, the labourer would be dismissed, and the creditor would lose his chance of re-payment.

Lord WENSLEYDALE was understood to say that he had not been able to make up his mind that imprisonment could be dispensed with to the extent proposed by the noble and learned Lord.

The bill was read a second time.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, May 23.

### THE VACATION OF SEATS (HOUSE OF COMMONS) BILL.

On the motion for the second reading of this bill, Sir G. GREY explained the operation of the bill. If there happened to be four members holding the office of Under-Secretary in that House, and a fifth was nominated, his seat would become vacant, and he would not be capable of being elected so long as those four gentlemen continued to hold office; but it was impossible to say which of the number ought to be excluded from voting. It was not necessary that the bill should be made to apply to a principal Secretary of State, because his seat became vacant on his acceptance of office.

Colonel FRENCH observed upon an alleged irregularity on the last appointment of a Vice-President of the Council for Education, inasmuch as a new writ was issued, when, in reality, there was no vacancy created.

Mr. WALPOLE said that, as this bill overcame the difficulty which it was intended to meet, and did not alter the law, he did not intend to offer any opposition to the second reading; but, at the same time, he wished to guard the House against a conclusion which might be drawn from what had taken place upon this occasion. The select committee had been divided in opinion as to whether the fifth Under-Secretary was or was not disqualified from sitting by the statute of Anne. If, under that statute, all Under-Secretaries who were in the House had to go to their constituents for re-election upon accepting office, no harm could have been done, because each one must have undergone that trial, which every Minister of the Crown, upon accepting office, was bound to submit to. But if the number of members of that House who were entitled to hold office without going back to their constituents was not restricted, two dangers would arise to the independence of the House. First, the number of persons who could hold office without going back to their constituents at all would be increased; and secondly, an inducement would be offered to the Ministry to put the Principal Secretaries into the Lords, and leave the Under-Secretaries in that House. If it were to be held that the holders of offices under, but not direct from, the Crown were to be considered as privileged to sit in that House, provided the offices did not exist before the statute of Anne, the independence of the House would be more struck at than it had ever been within his recollection.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that his right hon. friend might safely assume that nothing which had occurred could be productive of any such precedent. If he understood the view of the select committee correctly, it was that the office of Under-Secretary was not an office within the meaning of the statute of Anne. This bill simply made the limitation which recent Acts of Parliament had placed upon the number of

persons holding office who might sit in the House of Commons more stringent and effective than at present.

The bill was then read a second time.

### COURTS OF JUSTICE.

Mr. A. MILLS asked whether it was the intention of the Government to abandon the bill for the concentration of the courts of justice, which they had considered it to be their intention to introduce first after Easter, and then immediately after Whitsuntide.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that the Government had not abandoned the bill, but that he was not able to fix the exact day for its introduction.

### COURT OF CHANCERY (IRELAND) BILL.

At the request of Mr. WHITESIDE,

Mr. O'HAGAN consented to postpone the order for the second reading of this bill till the very comprehensive returns relating to the business of the Court of Chancery, now on the table of the House, were printed.

### Pending Measures of Legislation.

#### INTOXICATING LIQUORS (PERMISSIVE) BILL.

Whereas the common sale of intoxicating liquors is a fruitful source of crime, immorality, pauperism, disease, insanity, and premature death, whereby not only the individuals who give way to drinking habits are plunged into misery, but grievous wrong is done to the persons and property of her Majesty's subjects at large, and the public rates and taxes are greatly augmented: and whereas it is right and expedient to confer upon the ratepayers of cities, boroughs, parishes, and townships, the power to prohibit such common sale as aforesaid: be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

1. It shall be lawful for or more ratepayers residing in any municipal borough or parish, by notice in writing under their hands, to require the mayor of such borough, or the overseers of the poor of such parish, to take the votes of the ratepayers as to the propriety of bringing into operation this Act; and the mayor, &c., within days, shall give public notice, specifying on what day, not earlier than days after notice, the ratepayers are to vote for or against the adoption of the Act.

2. Every person rated to the relief of the poor, or entitled to vote for poor law guardians, shall be entitled to one vote.

3. Voting to be by voting papers according to form in schedule.

4. Votes shall be collected by persons appointed by the mayor, &c.; to be collected on the day appointed for the voting as aforesaid, by persons employed by them; and no voting paper shall be received unless duly delivered at the residence of the voter, and collected by the appointed collector: Provided always that any person qualified to vote may apply for a voting paper.

5. The mayor, &c., shall, on the next day, examine the said votes, and declare whether the majority is in favour of or against the adoption of this Act: Provided always that this Act shall not be adopted unless at least two-thirds of the votes given be in favour thereof.

6. Fabrication, &c., of voting papers, or personation of voters, or other similar acts, to subject the offender, on conviction before two justices, to three months' imprisonment with or without hard labour.

7. If the Act be adopted, the mayor, &c., shall immediately give public notice thereof, and also give notice thereof to the Home Secretary and the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, and to the clerk to the justices acting in and for the borough or petty sessions district. Certificate of mayor, or certified copy thereof, shall be conclusive evidence in any proceedings under or by virtue of this Act that this Act was duly adopted within the said borough or parish.

9. After vote in favour of the adoption of this Act, a new vote may be taken after the expiration of three years.

10. After adoption of Act no licence whatever shall be granted or renewed for the sale of alcoholic liquor within the borough or parish; and any person selling or disposing of any alcoholic liquor within such borough or parish shall be dealt with as selling without license, and shall be subject to all the penalties provided for such offences: Provided that nothing herein contained shall affect any current license, or any sale of methylated spirits for use in arts and manufactures.

11. Meaning of "municipal borough," "parish," "mayor," "overseers of the poor," "alcoholic liquor."

SCHEDULE.

FORM A.

Voting Paper.

Title of Act.

Statement that requisition has been made.

	In favour of.	Against.
Do you vote for or against the adoption of this Act in this ?	J. S.	

Directions for use of voting paper.

Notice of the terms of section 6.

(Signed by the Mayor or Overseer.)

## COLONIAL TRIBUNALS & JURISPRUDENCE.

### CANADA.

We reprint the following from a legal publication of considerable weight and influence in the colony.

#### REPORTS AND REPORTERS.

Now that the subject of law reports and law reporters is attracting so much attention in the mother country we avail ourselves of the opportunity of giving to our readers some well written remarks from our contemporary—*The Legal Intelligencer*, of Philadelphia. The writer says,—

"The office of reporter requires some of the rarest qualities of the professional character, and some qualities which, though not of the kind strictly professional, must necessarily attend them. The union of the two classes is not common. Certainly the office requires, as a preliminary, constant attendance in court, good education and knowledge in the law; study of the record before, during, and after argument; intelligent apprehension of the argument on both sides, and after all a thorough understanding and mental possession of the opinion itself. In these things intellectual qualities of a common order will not suffice; nor habits of business either indolent or careless. Nothing material must be overlooked; nothing not material may be possessed. If constant communication is not had with the judges and the Court in the progress of the report—a matter difficult where judges are so scattered—the report will not be of the most perfect kind. Yet all this is but preliminary. There is requisite, as literary qualification, power, first of all, in *presenting the case*—presenting it, we mean, with the skill of the *mise en scene*; giving to its different parts their place, proportion, and due effect. In narrating there must be order and condensation; and both must be accompanied by exactness and elegance of expression, such as are not the possession of all good thinkers, nor of all good lawyers, nor even of all educated men. Every good lawyer, therefore, is not competent to fill such a post. The professional drudge will do nothing but disgrace it. Neither is the mere scholar a sufficient person."

"Then comes the syllabus of marginal abstract. The syllabus of a judicial opinion, though formally no part of the case itself, is, practically, the most important part of the report. It is, as it were, the *docket entry* of the judgment upon which we rely for notice of the judgment, and are justified in relying. We may add that in the hands of an able reporter, the syllabus may serve, and ought to serve, a higher purpose than convenience of reference. In reading a written opinion, even when we have the case well stated in advance, we are sometimes at a loss to know precisely what is the *gist* of a judgment, and what remarks are only indcement or surplussage. A reporter who has attended the argument, ascertains what are the points on which the judgment hinges; and it is *his* duty to announce at the head of his case—not every dictum, every truth which the judge may have used for illustration, for argument, for analogy—but that one point which alone it was understood by the court that it really decided. Accordingly, it is not uncommon to find the syllabus of an able and conscientious reporter of repute, like Burrow, or Durnford, or East, or Johnson, or Binney, referred to when an opinion is ambiguous, or obscure, as the evidence of what the court did in fact decide. The shading of the judicial argument has been lost in the black and white of a printed decision; the *emphatic point* of an adjudication may be missed by the distant reader in the length and illustrations of the opinion. The reporter it is, who, catch-

ing wisdom "as it flies,"—from what he *imbibed* in the progress of the case, from his study of the pleading, from his attention to the argument, and from his consideration of the current observations of the Court itself, is to light up and illustrate the opinion in its true and genuine meaning."

The same writer thus proceeds, in language fully justified by the occasion, to expose what has been called reporting the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States,—

"The reports of the Supreme Court of the United States have been for many years past—ever since the time, in fact, that Mr. Wheaton ceased to report them—eminently discreditable to our professional character, abroad, and a vexatious burden every way to those among us who were obliged to read them, at home. They have been in some cases almost unintelligible except to the counsel who argued, or to the judges who decided them. The careless or stupid way wherein whole deeds and wills, and documents of every kind, have been thrust in, bodily, when the case may turn upon two lines or but two words of them; the whole way, in short, in which the cases are stated, and the arguments of counsel are not stated—unintelligible itself, and making unintelligible every other part of the proceeding—has long disgusted the profession, and prevented anyone from reading the Federal reports of cases in their last adjudication, if they could possibly help it. We say little of the miserable shifts that have been sometimes resorted to for swelling the volumes; considerations, these last, prompted by motives quite beneath the attention or even the contempt of an honourable mind. But carelessness, stupidity, disorder in stating and reporting the body of the cases is not at all. The profession for forty years has had to complain of acts of incompetency and error, by the operation of which the decisions of the Court—the court of supreme authority throughout the land—are in effect falsified, the Bar misled, and the law abused. We charge that in repeated instances, in the syllabuses of cases, the decisions of the Court have been grossly misrepresented, and that it is certified by the reporter to the profession that the Court has decided that which the Court has not decided."

Without designing to be personal, we think we may say that there are some law reporters in Upper Canada who might profit by a perusal of the foregoing remarks. No duty is more important than that of *faithfully and expeditiously* furnishing to the profession and the public the decisions of the superior legal tribunals of the Province. It is not every man who is capable of being a good law reporter. There is required a combination of knowledge and business talents which few men possess. But still such men may be found, and when found should be accepted. Merit should be the only qualification for a law reporter, and appointments secured or held by other influences are not only unjust to the deserving, but pernicious to the best interests of the law and its administration.—*Up. Can. Law Journal*, March, 1864.

## FOREIGN TRIBUNALS & JURISPRUDENCE.

### FRANCE.

The trial of the Count de la Pommerais, who was lately indicted in Paris for the murder of Madame de Pauw, and whose trial has excited considerable attention in this country, not only from the magnitude of the charge, but even more from the course of extreme partizanship, so revolting to English notions, taken by the presiding judge, terminated last week in a verdict of guilty. No mention of extenuating circumstances having been made, La Pommerais was condemned to death.

The indictment, which, in accordance with French practice, detailed the circumstances of the case about to be presented to the jury with all the minuteness and almost the vivacity of a novel, may be epitomised as follows:—

"At the beginning of November last their lived in a small lodging on the second floor in the Rue Bonaparte, a woman of the age of forty-two, who, ever since 1853, had been the widow of a painter named Pauw. She was left without fortune and with three children, the eldest of whom was only eight years old. Her health was habitually good, and down to the date of November 16 she was in no way ill; but at half past six in the evening of November 17, this woman, so full of life but the day before, died from the effects of vomiting, with which she had been seized the night before, and the violence and fatal issue of which appeared altogether inexplicable."

This event naturally gave rise to suspicions, in consequence of which Mr. Guehon, brother-in-law of the deceased, charged La Pommerais with having poisoned her in order to obtain the amount of certain insurances which he had effected on her life.

The indictment then proceeds to describe minutely the



several steps taken by Drs. Gaudinot, Tardieu, and others, with a view to discovering the cause of her death, which let them to report positively that she died from poison, and to state their reasons for believing that that poison was *digitalis* (fox-glove).

The next passages in this document we give *verbatim* :—

"The motive was then to be sought for. Assuredly this could neither have been vengeance nor hatred. Madame Pauw had no enemies, neither had she any next of kin interested in her death; the fruits of her labour constituted her only fortune, the sole resource of her three children. Of all her acquaintance, one individual alone could be a gainer by her death, and this individual was the accused, La Pommerais. He had known Madame Pauw for several years; he attended her husband in 1858, and after his death he very soon became the lover of the widow. Their relations on the footing of lover and mistress continued till the middle of 1861, but in the month of August in that year M. le Pommerais married Mlle. Dubizy, and for more than two years afterwards he never saw Madame Pauw. He even refused to go to see her children when they were ill.

"One day however, in the month of June last, Madame Pauw, to her great surprise, found him once more in her lodgings, and by way of explanation of his sudden return, he said he had hit upon a plan for providing for her children in the future. He told her that she must not tell anyone of the means which he proposed, and, without entering into details, merely said that a life insurance was the thing projected.

"Having thus re-established relations with Madame Pauw, he proposed that she should insure her life for a sum of 550,000 fr., that he would pay the premiums, and that she should assign the policies to him. But, it being obvious that in this way neither Madame Pauw nor her children would get any benefit, La Pommerais added that he could manage to get for her an almost immediate income by this arrangement. He suggested that a little while after the policy was effected she should pretend to be seriously ill, and make the insurance office believe that she was on the point of death; then he would go to the company and propose to them to cancel the policy on the terms of paying her a life annuity of 6,000 fr., to run from January 1, 1864. He would share this annuity with her, and in this way she would be better off than she had ever been before in her life. Madame Pauw had not the courage to reject this strange proposal. She shut her eyes to the dishonesty of the speculation. She was incapable of suspecting the real designs of La Pommerais, dominated as she was by her passion for him—a passion now revived, and stronger than ever. She blindly consented to let him arrange the matter as he desired."

It then describes the process by which La Pommerais (or Madame Pauw) effected six policies for sums amounting in all to 550,000 fr. (£22,000), at an annual premium of 18,840 fr. (£753 12s. 0d.). These sums were paid by or through La Pommerais, to whom all the policies were duly assigned. It then states that La Pommerais had bought a quantity of *digitalis* to be ready for use, and had then proceeded with the scheme concocted between him and Madame Pauw that she should feign illness. This she did, pretending to have had a severe fall followed by vomiting and pains in the stomach.

She then, it alleges, agreed to keep her bed, and pretended to be worse than ever.

Then it proceeds:—"Madame Pauw did not leave her room after November 12, and always wore a nightcap as though she were ill, in order the better to deceive the doctors who it was expected the companies would send to visit her. La Pommerais said he would make her take something to cause agitation.

"Meanwhile, and before the realisation of this perfidious promise, so well calculated to render Madame Pauw disposed to take unhesitatingly whatever he might choose to give her, and to prevent her from being frightened by any disagreeable symptoms which might follow, her health was in reality excellent, and she was, moreover, extremely cheerful.

"No sensible change, however, yet appeared in the health of the pretended sick person. On the Monday at five o'clock she dined in company with the two Misses Biord and their mother. She expected a visit from La Pommerais. He came at about eight o'clock. He stayed with her a long while, and nobody else saw her till the morning of the next day. At half-past six the widow Pigerre, who came as usual to bring the bread, was surprised to find the key outside the door, whereas it was Madame Pauw's habit to take it inside. This woman went into the bedroom and found Madame Pauw in a terrible state.

Her face betrayed great suffering; her bed and the flooring near it were stained by vomiting."

It then details the circumstances of the death, which shortly afterwards followed, adding—

"He but too well knew what was the cause of this woman's death, and of that cause there cannot now be the slightest doubt—Widow de Pauw was poisoned by La Pommerais in the evening of November 16. The accused was the last person who saw her that night."

It then proceeds to combat the statements made by the prisoner, on his *procès verbal*, and concludes by summing up the evidence against him with an animosity and persistence which no counsel for the prosecution would, in this country, think himself justified in displaying.

The trial lasted six days, and the evidence fully established all the material facts set forth in the indictment, EXCEPT that the deceased had been poisoned. On that question the testimony was conflicting, and notwithstanding the utmost efforts of the presiding judge to break down the evidence of Dr. Hebert on that point, it was evident that the case for the prosecution had been much shaken, and it was fully expected that the jury would at least so far give the prisoner the benefit of the doubt as to shelter him from death, by finding that there were "extenuating circumstances," though, if he did the act, it is not easy to conceive what they could be. After the fatal "Guilty by a majority"—all present waited to catch the sound of "extenuating circumstances," but it did not come; so that the judge had no option but to sentence him to death, informing him at the same time that he had three clear days—"trois jours francs"—to appeal against the sentence. La Pommerais rose from his seat, put forth his right arm, and in a husky voice, which, low as it was, everyone present distinctly heard, said, "I swear I am innocent." He was then led away to his cell.

He has since appealed to the Cour de Cassation, a proceeding which has become of course with all "*condamnés*" who can afford it, as they cannot lose anything by the move, and at least gain time.

There was a second indictment, accusing La Pommerais of having, in 1861, poisoned his mother-in-law, Madame Debizy, by *digitalis*; but of that he was acquitted.

## AMERICA.

### THE SAXON.

Acting-master Charles Danenhower, of the United States navy, has been brought to trial at the Navy Yard, Philadelphia, upon a charge of murder on the high seas, in shooting James Gray, mate of the British barque *Saxon*, in October last, off the coast of Africa. The charges are preferred by Mr. Seward, Secretary of State, upon the information of Lord Lyons, the British minister. The case was submitted to a court of inquiry, after the return of the *Vanderbilt*, on which the accused was serving; and he was fully exonerated from blame and justified for the act, and the finding, it was understood, was approved by the secretary of the navy. His Lordship, the British minister, not being satisfied with the result of the proceedings, has induced the Government to convene a court-martial for the trial of Mr. Danenhower, and the case is, as we have said, in process of trial.

## ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS.

### Queen's Bench.

#### NOTICES OF ADMISSION.

##### Trinity Term, 1864.

[The clerks' names appear in small capitals, and the attorneys to whom articulated or assigned follow in ordinary type.]

COCKAYNE, BEN HAWKBRIDGE.—Benjamin Hawkridge, Nottingham; Abraham Cann, Nottingham; Godfrey Heathcote, Nottingham.

KENTON, JOHN HAMER.—William Stott, Rochdale.

TINKER, JOHN FRANCIS.—Joseph Rayner, Huddersfield.

WILDING, THOMAS.—J. S. W. Herring, Stafford-street, Middlesex.

##### Trinity Vacation, 1864.

FOX, RICHARD RETNOLDS.—Henry Bush, Bristol.

WOOD, EDMUND SMITH (articled in the name of Samuel Edmund Smith).—G. E. Williams, Cheltenham.

##### Last Day of Trinity Term, 1864.

ANDERTON, JOHN EDWARD.—William Wilkinson, Blackburn.

BARTLEY, REILLY BLOXAM.—W. Evans, Coleman-street.

**BIGGENDEN, JOHN PATTENDER.**—J. Biggenden, Wallbrook; T. E. Tomlins, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

**CLARKE, CHARLES GUYON.**—Henry Vallance, 20, Essex-street, Strand.

**CUDLIFF, RALPH BROOKING.**—Christopher V. Bridgman, Tavistock.

**FLUKER, ROBERT.**—R. Home, Berwick-on-Tweed; J. Fluker, Symond's-inn.

**GALLOWAY, HENRY.**—Benjamin K. Tidswell, Manchester.

**GUTRIDGE, HENRY.**—Peter Wright, Liverpool.

**HEWLETT, RICHARD.**—William A. Preston, Stroud; John T. White, 11, Bedford-row.

**HINCHLIFF, EDWIN.**—J. Sewell, Old Bond-street.

**LOMAX, JOHN.**—Henry Wheeler, Manchester; Henry Howe, Victoria-street, Westminster.

**MACDONALD, DOUGLAS JOHN KINNIE.**—Fitzherbert Macdonald, Salisbury.

**MURROW, CHARLES.**—James Murrow, Liverpool.

**PARKIN, PAXTON WILLIAM.**—Henry T. Johns Ringwood.

**RAT, JOHN TANNER.**—James Green, Bradford.

**READ, JOHN CHARLES.**—C. J. Welchman, Southam.

**RIDSDALE, FRANCIS JAMES.**—F. J. Ridsdale, Gray's-inn-square.

**ROBINSON, CECIL HAWES.**—R. J. Dobie, Bedford-row; Robinson & Preston, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

**SPEAKMAN, JOHN VAUGHAN.**—John Speakman, Nantwich; E. D. Broughton, Nantwich.

**SPENCER, GEORGE WAKEFIELD.**—William Spencer, Birmingham.

**THOMPSON, WILLIAM CATON.**—Benjamin S. Clay, Liverpool; Henry Marshall, Liverpool.

**WOODHAMS, DANIEL THOMAS.**—J. J. Blake, King William-street. [See also page 554.]

#### APPLICATION TO BE ADMITTED A SOLICITOR OF THE HIGH COURT OF CHANCERY.

*Trinity Term, 1864, pursuant to 20 & 21 Vict. c. 77, s. 44.*

**DEACON, WILLIAM COPE.**—Robert Edward Pownall, Doctors'-commons.

#### APPLICATIONS FOR RE-ADMISSION.

*Last day of Trinity Term, 1864.*

**CROSS, William Henry Wright,** County Gaol, Taunton; and House of Correction, Coldbath-fields.

**OLDKNOW, Samuel,** 12, Arundel-square, Barnsbury, 10, Ellington-street, Barnsbury; and 16, Euston-road.

#### APPLICATIONS TO TAKE OUT OR RENEW CERTIFICATES.

*June 14, 1864.*

**Adams, Francis Hamp,** Upton Bishop, near Ross.

**Aldham, Harcourt Huxley,** King's Lynn.

**Ashley, Alfred,** 3, Richmond-road, Dalston.

**Chawner, Richard John,** Uttoxeter.

**Craddock, George William,** Nuneaton.

**Holt, Jonathan,** Coventry.

**Hunt, William Clove,** Chester.

**Lowe, Richard,** 15, Mildmay-street, Stoke Newington.

**Pain, George Cave,** Frimley, Surrey.

**Peniston, Lewis Frederick,** Clifton; Kurrachee; Salisbury; and Brighton.

**Selby, James Addison,** Aylesford, Kent.

**Sharood, Charles James,** Garden-road, Peckham.

**Taylor, William,** Clifton; and Bristol.

**Trinder, Henry William,** Old Broad-street, City; and Adelaide-road, Hampstead.

**Van Sandau, Frederick Edgar,** 6, Mecklenburgh-square; and Huddersfield.

#### COURT PAPERS.

##### Court of Chancery.

*Cause List for Trinity Term, 1864.*

#### BEFORE THE LORD CHANCELLOR AND THE LORDS JUSTICES.

##### Appeals.

**Knox v. Gye.** (W.—Feb. 13.)

**River Fergus Navigation and Embankment Co. v. Cahill.** (W.—March 14.)

**Hill v. South Staffordshire Railway Co.** (S.—April 11.)

**Smith v. Whitmore.** (W.—April 12.)

**Weir v. Freshfield.** (R.—April 21.)

**In re Brestle; Brestle v. Burdett.** (R.—April 27.)

**Solicitors and General Life Assurance Society v. Lamb.** (W.—April 29.)

**Coventry v. Chichester.** (W.—May 6.)

**Davies v. Otty.** (R.—May 11.)

**Pulling v. London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Co.** (R.—May 13.)

##### Causes.

(L. C.) **Baxendale v. West Midland Railway Co.** Motion for decree (part heard).

(L. C.) **Baxendale v. Great Western Railway Co.** Motion for decree.

#### BEFORE THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

##### Causes, &c.

**Lewis v. Templer.** Further consideration.

**Clark v. Eversfield.** Motion for decree.

**Earnshaw v. Bradbury.** Motion for decree.

**Parton v. Parton.** Ditto.

**Ormerod v. Roston.** Further consideration.

**Markwell v. Bull.** Motion for decree.

**Markwell v. Markwell.** Ditto.

**Braithwaite v. Kearns.** Ditto.

**Reeves v. Matthews.** Ditto.

**Buckingham v. Whitta.** Ditto.

**Gamble v. The St. Helen's Canal and Railway Co.** Ditto.

**Maw v. Pearson.** Further consideration.

**Countess of Harrington v. Sir William Atherton.** Motion for decree (25 May).

**Cooksey v. Cooper.** Motion for decree.

**Davis v. Davis.** Cause.

**Carr v. Jackson.** Motion for decree.

**Wrigglesworth v. Abbott.** Ditto.

**Howell v. Harper; Fulford v. Grice.** Further consideration with petition.

**Hume v. Laidlaw.** Motion for decree.

**Mattingly v. Stacy.** Cause, witnesses to be cross-examined.

**Saunders v. Evans.** Motion for decree.

**Groom v. Hughes.** Ditto.

**Gregory v. Patchett.** Cause.

**Triscott v. Brown.** Further consideration.

**Attorney-General v. Hospital of St. John, Bedford.** Motion for decree.

**Baker v. Fritchard.** Ditto.

**Davis v. Turvey.** Further consideration.

**Forster v. Ridley.** Motion for decree.

**London and Westminster Wine Co. (Limited) v. Wright.** Motion for decree.

**Thomas v. Mackenzie.** Ditto.

**Vivian v. Browne.** Ditto.

**Holloway v. Holloway.** Ditto.

**In re Fogwill; Fogwill v. Sutcliffe.** Further consideration adjourned from chambers and summons to vary.

**Winch v. Lumb.** Motion for decree.

**Paul v. Pole.** Cause.

**Hewitt v. Nelson.** Cause.

**Moorhouse v. Moorhouse.** Further consideration.

**Rede v. Oaks.** Further consideration and summons to vary certificate.

**Pilling v. Pilling.** Motion for decree.

**Leary v. Shout.** Ditto.

**Edwards v. Johnson.** Ditto.

**Brophy v. Bellamy.** Further consideration.

**Rastall v. Toulson.** Cause, witnesses to be examined (31st May).

**Luff v. Lord.** Motion for decree.

**Bryant v. Millard.** Ditto.

**Greenway v. Turner.** Cause.

**Baxter v. Thompson.** Motion for decree.

**Hopkins v. Boardman.** Ditto.

**Cogent v. Gibson.** Ditto.

**Warden v. Piddington.** Ditto.

**Woolmer v. Hirtzell.** Ditto.

**Phillips v. Davies.** Further consideration.

**Milnes v. Hughes.** Motion for decree.

**Chapman v. Chapman.** Further consideration.

**Labalmondieri v. Reidy.** Motion for decree.

**Attorney-General v. Earl Craven.** Further consideration.

**Guy v. Wilson.** Cause.

**Howard v. Earl of Shrewsbury.** Ditto.

**Iagram v. Brown.** Further consideration.

**Neve v. Flood.** Further consideration and two summonses to vary.

**Dadswell v. McCabe.** Motion for decree.

**Walters v. Woodbridge.** Ditto.

Hughes v. Jones. Motion for decree.  
 Shirley v. Heygate. Ditto.  
 Shirley v. Heygate. Ditto.  
 Shirley v. Heygate. Ditto.  
 Turner v. Turner. Further consideration.  
 Richardson v. Goodson. Motion for decree.  
 Long v. Davey. Further consideration.  
 Hart v. Cuthbert. Motion for decree.  
 Potts v. Britton. Ditto.  
 Jones v. McCarter. Further consideration.  
 Wood v. Drew. Motion for decree.  
 Brawn v. Richardson. Further consideration.  
 Chapman v. Jefferson. Ditto.  
 Finch v. Everett. Cause.  
 Curths v. Gibson. Motion for decree.  
 Moss v. Moss. Further consideration.  
 King v. Marshall. Motion for decree.  
 Casburn v. Arber. Ditto.  
 In re Mundell; Aitchison v. Parkinson. Further consideration from chambers.  
 Cresswell v. Jackson. Further consideration.  
 Lloyd v. Banks. Motion for decree.  
 Gammon v. Sandy. Ditto.  
 Harvey v. Trenchard. Ditto.  
 Mathew v. Jennens. Further consideration.  
 Ransom v. Ransom. Motion for decree.  
 Allison v. Allison. Further consideration.  
 Small v. Young. Motion for decree.  
 Lee v. Lee. Ditto.  
 Young v. Young. Further consideration.  
 Calliard v. Hanham. Motion for decree.  
 Ardeckne v. Beckford. Ditto.  
 Todd v. Simpson. Further consideration.  
 Laurie v. Crush. Ditto.  
 Solly v. Hincks. Cause.  
 Grimwood v. Webber. Motion for decree.  
 Renwick v. Hackworth. Ditto.  
 Pratt v. Lord. Further consideration from chambers.  
 Hinde v. Hinde. Special case.  
 Chadwick v. Turner. Motion for decree.  
 Wilson v. West Hartlepool Harbour and Railway Co. Cause.  
 Collier v. Knox. Motion for decree.  
 Banks v. Cartwright. Ditto.  
 Fowler v. Fowler. Ditto.  
 Borrás v. Hodge. Ditto.

BEFORE THE VICE-CHANCELLOR SIR RICHARD T. KINDERSLEY.

*Causes, &c.*

Wilkinson v. Slee. Motion for decree (part heard).  
 Gill v. Aggs. Old executions.  
 Hewitt v. Hewitt. Motion for decree.  
 Gaskoin v. Millward. Ditto.  
 Garnons v. Garnons. Cause.  
 Shrubsole v. Schneider; Schneider v. Shrubsole. Trial by jury. (1st June).  
 Salisbury v. Churchill. Motion for decree.  
 Devron v. Devron. Further consideration.  
 Barker v. Peile. Motion for decree.  
 Bennett v. Bennett. Motion for decree.  
 Williams v. Williams. Cause.  
 Williams v. Williams. Cause.  
 Baron L. N. D. Rothschild v. Cannon. Ditto.  
 Watson v. Sir G. Rosa. Motion for decree.  
 Riddel v. Smith. Cause, witnesses to be examined (30th May).  
 Lee v. Hamerton. Motion for decree.  
 Adams v. Hebben. Cause.  
 Garner v. Garner. Motion for decree.  
 Beasley v. Attenborough. Ditto.  
 Tiffen v. Parker. Cause, witnesses to be cross-examined (25th May).  
 Homer v. Homer. Motion for decree.  
 Rayner v. Stears. Ditto.  
 Jones v. Rees. Ditto.  
 Barber v. Kent. Cause set down by defendant.  
 Reid v. Don Pedro North del Rey Gold Mining Co. (Limited). Cause.  
 Goldschmidt v. Hall. Motion for decree.  
 Sharpe v. Waldron. Ditto.  
 Kendall v. Cook. Cause.  
 Cook v. Atkinson. Ditto.  
 Besset v. Dearn. Ditto.  
 Hewer v. Kents. Motion for decree.  
 Lord Ranelagh v. Melton. Ditto.

Hendrie v. Springfield. Cause.  
 Wardell v. Lawty. Ditto.  
 Riley v. Croydon. Motion for decree.  
 Lownsbrough v. Coleman. Ditto.  
 Smart v. Hawksworth. Ditto.  
 Poole v. Foxwell. Ditto.  
 Bruton v. Morris. Ditto.  
 Collinson v. White. Ditto.  
 Smith v. Charles. Ditto.  
 Watson v. Rose, Knt. Ditto.  
 Thrupp v. Preston. Further consideration.  
 In re Cresswell; Coxwell v. Franklinsky. Further consideration adjourned from chambers.  
 Parsons v. Peters. Further consideration.  
 Jackson v. Parkin. Motion for decree.  
 Leese v. Knight. Further consideration.  
 Millard v. Ellyett. Motion for decree.  
 Savile v. Kinnaird. Ditto.  
 Huskisson v. Underhill. Further consideration.  
 Watts v. Griffin. Motion for decree.  
 Hull v. Falconer. Further consideration.  
 Gant v. Heales. Motion for decree.  
 Hakewill v. White. Further consideration.  
 Wyndham v. Rickford. Ditto.  
 Earl of Eglinton v. Lamb, Bt. Motion for decree.  
 Earl of Eglinton v. Lamb, Bt. Ditto.  
 Hare v. Pryce. Further consideration.

BEFORE THE VICE-CHANCELLOR SIR JOHN STUART.

*Causes, &c.*

Naylor v. Vickers. Executions to answer.  
 Mitchell v. Windham. Motion for decree.  
 Willson v. Featherstone. Further consideration.  
 West v. Borrett. Motion for decree.  
 Johnson v. Stavert. Ditto.  
 Lawless v. Thunder. Ditto.  
 Archer v. Alp. Ditto.  
 Hutchison v. Holmes. Ditto.  
 Walker v. Kenrick. Ditto.  
 Dames v. Ward. Cause.  
 Ihler v. Davies. Further consideration and petition in Davidson v. Battine (after term).  
 Weir v. Weir. Motion for decree.  
 Prowett v. Prowett. Ditto.  
 Malpas v. Peake. Ditto.  
 Clark v. Clark. Ditto.  
 Spore v. Barnaby. Cause and petition.  
 Jamieson v. Chater. Motion for decree.  
 Banner v. England. Cause.  
 Scoley v. Lee. Cause.  
 Corner v. Okey. Motion for decree.  
 Franckum v. Harford. Further consideration.  
 In re Whitehead; Godfrey v. Whitehead. Further consideration from chambers.  
 Bartley v. Bartley. Special case.  
 Wroe v. Seed. Further consideration.  
 Poole v. Beddall. Further consideration.  
 Barrow v. Griffith; Barrow v. Newman. Further consideration and two summonses.  
 Cockshott v. Lister. Further consideration.  
 Heslop v. Magnay. Further consideration.  
 Joel v. Eastham. Cause and summons.  
 Stubbings v. Fisher. Further consideration.  
 Woodhouse v. Hall. Further consideration.  
 Nicholson v. Newton. Further consideration.  
 Head v. Valpy. Ditto.  
 Williams v. Wilson. Special case.  
 Wooton v. Hulse. Further consideration.  
 Little v. Newburn. Further consideration and motion.  
 Taylor v. Yarde. Further consideration.  
 Lane v. Brillman. Cause.  
 Snowden v. Wright. Further consideration set down by defendant.  
 Newby v. Cram; Bramwell v. Cram. Cause.  
 Crozier v. Newby. Cause.  
 Miller v. Bush. Motion for decree.  
 Rooth v. Sharpe. Ditto.  
 Radcliffe v. Radcliffe. Cause.  
 Kennedy v. Killick. Motion for decree and petition.  
 Holberton v. Clement. Motion for decree.  
 Cubitt v. Smith. Ditto.  
 Massey v. Massey. Cause.  
 Green v. Crockett. Ditto.



Postgate v. Barnes. Motion for decree.  
 Goldsmid v. Heathcote. Ditto.  
 Cornforth v. Pointon. Cause.  
 Owens v. Hunt. Further consideration.  
 Stronach v. Unthank. Motion for decree.  
 Girdlestone v. Richards and five other causes. Further consideration adjourned petition and summons.  
 Gadsby v. Green. Motion for decree.  
 Staniland v. Wade. Cause.  
 Blackburn v. Horwood. Further consideration.  
 Stapleton v. Salisbury. Motion for decree.  
 Earl of Darnley v. London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Co. Cause.  
 Normandy's Patent Marine Aerated Fresh Water Co. (Limited) v. Normandy. Ditto.  
 Martin v. Francia. Motion for decree.  
 Buckley v. Blackburne. Ditto.  
 Hearn v. Bannister. Ditto.  
 Crossley v. Lord. Further consideration.  
 Tottenham v. Emmett. Motion for decree.  
 Godfrey v. Whitehead. Further consideration.  
 Vickers v. Todd. Motion for decree.  
 Smith v. Moreton. Ditto.  
 Fletcher v. Fletcher. Special case.  
 Scott v. Walker. Further consideration.  
 Long v. Bowring. Motion for decree.  
 Silvester v. Silvester. Further consideration.  
 Turner v. Burkenshaw. Motion for decree.  
 Bothamley v. Gordon. Special case.  
 Emmet v. Tottenham. Motion for decree.  
 Bubb v. Green. Ditto.  
 Phillips v. Phillips. Ditto.  
 Simpson v. Terry. Ditto.  
 Perrott v. Edmunds. Cause.  
 Burton v. Granger. Motion for decree.  
 Howard v. Howard. Ditto.  
 Redman v. Gregory. Ditto.  
 Harrison v. Collinson. Cause.  
 Stares v. Penton. Motion for decree.  
 Moss v. Chapple. Ditto.  
 Muspratt v. Ventham. Cause.  
 Priestley v. Ashworth. Motion for decree.  
 Attwood v. Ware. Cause.  
 Davis v. Woodman. Motion for decree.  
 Wilkie v. Beacham. Further consideration.  
 Millard v. Harvey. Motion for decree.  
 Philpot v. Haynes. Ditto.  
 Goodman v. Jones. Cause.  
 Thompson v. Thompson. Ditto.  
 Liddon v. Howard. Motion for decree.  
 Pomfret v. Plucknett. Ditto.  
 Morgan v. Morgan. Ditto.  
 Withiecomb v. Wamby. Ditto.  
 Jarvis v. Ferguson. Further consideration.  
 Maythorn v. Palmer. Motion for decree.  
 Charlesworth v. Jennings. Ditto.  
 Ridley v. Ridley. Ditto.  
 Mitchell v. Mitchell. Further consideration and motion.  
 Weston v. Collins. Motion for decree.  
 Wood v. Cox. Further consideration.  
 Turrell v. Hocking. Motion for decree.  
 Rackham v. De la Mere. Further consideration.  
 Mac Rae v. Allardyne. Ditto.  
 Scott v. Smeeton. Motion for decree.  
 Beresford v. Conyers. Ditto.  
 Bailly v. Keighley. Ditto.  
 Phillips v. Phillips. Ditto.  
 Biddulph v. Biddulph. Ditto.  
 Jeffreys v. Stewart. Further consideration.  
 Sir C. C. W. Domville, Bart., v. Wilkie. Motion for decree.  
 Plucknett v. Pomfret. Ditto.  
 Lindsay v. Orman. Ditto.  
 Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Co. v. Birmingham Canal Navigation. Ditto.  
 Phillips v. Storkie. Further consideration.  
 Duckworth v. Hudson. Motion for decree.  
 Hardy v. Hardy. Ditto.  
 Holloway v. Webber. Ditto.  
 Hazlerigg v. Robson. Further consideration.  
 Black v. Black. Cause (short).  
 Potter v. Cross. Motion for decree.  
 Taylor v. Sparrow. Further consideration.  
 Piggott v. Piggott. Motion for decree.  
 Crow v. Cross. Further consideration.

Davis v. Davis. Motion for decree (short).  
 Tee v. Bridger. Cause.  
 In re Davies; Baldwin v. Read. Further consideration from chambers.  
 Bryson v. Hull; Hull v. Bryson. Further consideration (short).  
 Leyland v. Naylor. Motion for decree (short).  
 Marshall v. Smith. Cause.  
 Wetton v. Wildgoose. Motion for decree.  
 Hervey v. Hethorn. Ditto.  
 Hervey v. Chapman. Ditto.  
 Butt v. Graham; Windus v. Graham. Further consideration.  
 Parry v. Hayward. Motion for decree.

BEFORE THE VICE-CHANCELLOR SIR WILLIAM PAGE WOOD.

*Causes, &c.*

Hutchings v. Leader; Leader v. Hutchings. Motion for decree (part heard).  
 Dent v. Clayton. Special case.  
 Ford v. Tynte and six other causes (re-hearing).  
 Parsons v. North. Motion for decree.  
 Tompsett v. Harmer. Further consideration.  
 Foster v. Gladstone. Motion for decree.  
 Beavill v. Sheehy. Ditto.  
 Attorney-General v. Metropolitan Board of Works. Ditto.  
 Tynte v. Randolph. Cause.  
 Simpson v. Brown. Motion for decree.  
 Wedderburne v. Thomas. Cause *pro confesso*.  
 Tynte v. Ford. Cause.  
 Davies v. Stocks. Motion for decree.  
 Allan v. Sugden. Ditto.  
 Durrant v. Durrant. Ditto.  
 Cooper v. Ricardo. Cause.  
 Simpson v. Holliday. Trial before the Court without a jury.  
 Fenton v. Hankins. Further consideration.  
 Salter v. Cliff. Cause, cross-examination of witnesses (25th May).  
 Orridge v. Wilks. Motion for decree.  
 Bishop v. Scott. Ditto.  
 Cropton v. Corner. Ditto.  
 David v. Jenkins. Ditto.  
 The Governors of St. Thomas's Hospital v. The Corporation of London. Ditto.  
 Edgley v. Kellock. Ditto.  
 Taddy v. Gillow. Ditto.  
 Daniel v. Arkwright. Cause.  
 Hamner v. Chance. Motion for decree.  
 Evans v. Stratford. Special case.  
 Elkins v. Ward. Cause.  
 Smalley v. Loftus. Motion for decree.  
 Medland v. Horsham and Guildford Direct Railway Company. Ditto.  
 Defries v. Defries. Ditto.  
 Bridges v. Highton. Ditto.  
 Pearson v. Buggins. Ditto.  
 Harrison v. Harrison. Ditto.  
 Tynte v. Beavan. Cause.  
 Cox v. Taylor. Motion for decree.  
 Schweitzer v. Holder. Ditto.  
 Fisher v. Dingley. Ditto.  
 Fisher v. Phelps. Ditto.  
 Wilson v. Bullivant. Ditto.  
 Thomas v. Thomas. Ditto.  
 Forbes v. Mackenzie. Cause.  
 Browne v. Freeman. Motion for decree.  
 Randles v. Salter. Further consideration and summons.  
 Allan v. Scott. Motion for decree.  
 The London and South-Western Railway Co. v. Bridge. Ditto.  
 Watkins v. Weston. Ditto.  
 Shreeve v. Shreeve. Further consideration.  
 Chaytor v. The Sittingbourne and Sheerness Railway Co. Motion for decree.  
 Daniel v. Courthorpe. Ditto.  
 Hooper v. Gunn. Cause.  
 McLellan v. Gunn. Ditto.  
 Aylwin v. Challen. Further consideration and summons to vary.  
 Langford v. Christmas. Motion for decree.  
 Tayler v. Cox. Cause.  
 Fuller v. Chamier. Re-hearing.  
 Eastaff v. Carrier. Further consideration.  
 Sichel v. Raphael. Cause against defendant Graham only.  
 White v. Lyons. Motion for decree.

**Walker v. Drummond.** Further consideration.  
**James v. Pugh.** Motion for decree.  
**Tongue v. Tongue.** Special case.  
**Smith v. Baker.** Motion for decree.  
**Fisher v. Moon.** Ditto.  
**Underhay v. Tyler.** Ditto.  
**Bird v. Lake; Bird v. Turner.** Cause.  
**Porter v. Dawson.** Further consideration.  
**Davies v. Davies.** Motion for decree.

### Exchequer Chamber.

#### Sittings in Error.

The following days have been appointed for the argument of errors and appeals:—

QUEEN'S BENCH.	
Tuesday .....	June 14   Thursday..... June 16
Wednesday .....	June 15
COMMON PLEAS.	
Friday .....	June 17   Saturday .....
EXCHEQUER.	
Monday.....	June 20   Tuesday .....
June 21	

On Thursday last the judges settled the several circuits upon which they will respectively proceed to hold the ensuing Summer Assizes, when the following arrangements were finally determined upon:—

**Home Circuit.**—Mr Baron Martin and Mr. Justice Willes.  
**Oxford Circuit.**—Mr Justice Mellor and Mr Justice Shee.  
**Northern Circuit.**—Lord Chief Justice of England, and Mr. Baron Pigott.  
**Midland Circuit.**—Mr. Justice Blackburn and Mr. Justice Keating.  
**Norfolk Circuit.**—Mr. Baron Bramwell and Mr. Baron Channell.  
**Western Circuit.**—Mr. Justice Williams and Mr. Justice Byles.  
**North Wales and Chester Circuit.**—The Lord Chief Justice of the Courts of Common Pleas.  
**South Wales and Chester Circuit.**—Mr. Justice Crompton.  
 The Lord Chief Baron will remain in town as vacation judge. It appears from the notice issued that the recent alteration of the circuits will not be acted upon on this occasion.

## PUBLIC COMPANIES.

### RAILWAY BILLS.

On the 23rd May the railway committees resumed their sittings after the recess. Further evidence was taken in Lord Stanley's Committee on the proposed new metropolitan railways, where Mr. Allport, traffic manager of the Midland Railway, gave evidence in favour of the London and Blackwall Railway Company's proposed extensions near the Thames as important river communications in connection both with London and the North.

A parliamentary return shows that the Income Tax paid in Great Britain in the last five years has averaged annually 7s. 11½d. per head of the estimated population, and in Ireland 2s. 4½d. In 1863 the amount was 8s. 6½d. per head in Great Britain, and 2s. 5½d. in Ireland.

The report of the Registrar-General for the first quarter of 1864 shows the death-rate was one of the highest ever known, being 28 in the 1,000 instead of 25; and the total, 143,030, was 14,698 in excess of the average. The cause was the excessive cold, which, strange to say, was exceptionally felt in London, where the inhabitants are excessively sensitive to cold. On January 7th the thermometer descended to 17·7 below freezing, and the cold killed numbers.

## BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

### BIRTHS.

**MORRIS**—On May 22, at Salthill, the wife of Michael Morris, Esq., Q.C., of a daughter, stillborn.  
**PARKES**—On May 22, at 32, Priory-road, Kilburn, the wife of Sir H. S. Parkes, K.C.B., H.B.M.'s Consul, Shanghai, of a daughter.  
**RANDLES**—On May 11, at Ellesmere, Shropshire, the wife of W. H. Randles, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.  
**SCOTT**—On May 20, the Lady Victoria Hope Scott, wife of James Robert Hope Scott, Esq., Q.C., of a daughter.

### MARRIAGES.

**HARDING—WATERLOW**—On May 19, at the parish church of St. Michael, Cornhill, Charles Harding, Esq., of Netting-hill, London, to Mary Jameson, eldest daughter of A. J. Waterlow, Esq., of the firm of Waterlow and Sons, and of Great Dooda, Reigate.  
**HARDING—HOOKER**—On May 19, at Sheerness, the Rev. Thomas Harding, Wesleyan Minister, to Beattie, elder daughter of Edward Hooker, Esq., Solicitor, of Banks Town.

### DEATHS.

**BURGES**—On May 6, at Birmingham, Susan, relict of the Rev. W. Cere Burges, Vicar of Osmothery, Yorkshire, and daughter of the late Richard Newton Bennett, Esq., of Blackstoops, county Wexford, Barrister-at-Law.  
**CHAMBERLAIN**—On May 18, James Hardy Chamberlain, Esq., Solicitor, of No. 26, University-street, aged 64.  
**STOCKEN**—On May 5, Maria, wife of William Stocken, Esq., Lendenhall-street, Solicitor, aged 38.  
**WHITE**—On May 21, at Goudhurst, Kent, Richard White, Esq., Solicitor, aged 90.

## UNCLAIMED STOCK IN THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

The amount of Stock heretofore standing in the following Names will be transferred to the Parties claiming the same, unless other Claimants appear within Three Months:—

**ARUNDELL, EDWARD**, Emerson-terrace, Southwark, Engineer, £250 Three per Cent. Annuities.—Claimed by the said Edward Arundell.  
**BURGESS, BURGESS**, Throgmorton-st, Stockbroker, BREWSTER, Rev. JAMES, Staffordshire, and BUSHBY FRANCIS CHASSERAUD, £50 lrs. 13. Three per Cent. Annuities.—Claimed by the said James Bowsher and Francis Chasseraud Bewsher, the survivors.  
**SAYER, ROBERT**, Yoxford, Suffolk, Esq., £175 New Three per Cent. Annuities.—Claimed by the said Robert Sayer.  
**WILSON, HENRY**, Royal Exchange, Auctioneer, deceased, £50 New Three per Cent. Annuities.—Claimed by Jane Wilson, widow, the sole executrix.

## LONDON GAZETTES.

### Winding-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, May 20, 1864.

#### LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

**Canadian Native Oil Company (Limited).**—Petition for winding-up, presented May 7, will be heard before Vice-Chancellor Wood on May 28. Lewin & Co, Southampton-st, Strand.  
**East Dyliffe Lead and Copper Mining Company (Limited).**—Petition for winding-up, presented April 29, will be heard before Vice-Chancellor Stuart on May 27. Fulbrook, Threadneedle-st.  
**Snowbrook Silver Lead Mining Company (Limited).**—Petition for winding-up, presented April 29, will be heard before Vice-Chancellor Stuart on May 27. Fulbrook, Threadneedle-st.

### Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, May 20, 1864.

**Clark, Jas**, Marlborough, Wilts, Wine Merchant. June 30. Phillips, Chippingham.  
**Gibbins, Wm**, Adstone, Northampton, Farmer. July 1. Jeffery & Son, Newland.  
**Metcher, Thos**, Southampton, Plumber. June 21. Gosler, Southampton.  
**Norbury, Thos**, Chorley, Chester, Farmer. June 21. Chew & Son, Manch.  
**Penington, Kitty**, Farnworth-within-Widnes, Lancaster, Spinster. June 24. Ward, Prescott.  
**Stewart, Jonathan**, Bishopwearmouth, Durham, Coolman. July 30. Wilford, Sunderland.

TUESDAY, May 24, 1864.

**Beadon, Wm**, Otterhead, Devon, Esq. June 24. Beadons & Sweet, Taunton.  
**Collins, John**, Manchester-st, St Marylebone, Gent. July 7. Burgoynes & Co, Oxford-st.  
**Farmer, Joseph**, Higham-on-the-Hill, Leicester, Farmer. July 14. Dewes & Norton, Nuneaton.  
**France, John**, Hale, Park-place-ter, Paddington, Esq. June 24. Stuart & Massey, Gray's Inn-sq.  
**Hooper, Geo Hy**, Coleman-st-bldgs, Merchant. Aug 1. Rivington, Fenchurch-bldgs.  
**Mallinson, John**, Wesley, Ann Eliza Mallinson, and Ann Eliza, Kingston-upon-Hull. Aug 1. Atkinson, Hull.  
**Murcott, Abraham**, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Gent. July 30. Haynes & Moore, Warwick.  
**Myne, Wm**, Chadwick, New River Head, Clerkenwell, Esq. Aug 1. Rivington, Fenchurch-bldgs.  
**Sampson, Benj**, St Wood, Cornwall, Esq. June 30. Shilson & Co, St Austell, Cornwall.  
**Sheppard, Thos**, Bate, Plymouth, Paymaster in her Majesty's Royal Navy. July 16. Phillips & Son, Plymouth.

### Assignments for Benefit of Creditors.

TUESDAY, May 24, 1864.

**Tulloch, Jas**, Montague-place, Bedford-sq, Esq. Aug 1. Rivington, Fenchurch-bldgs.  
**Whitaker, Geo**, Kingston-upon-Hull, Gent. Sept 1. Wilson, Hull.  
**Williamson, Marion**, Seymour-pl, Little Chelsea, Spinster. July 1. Wilkins & Blyth, St Swithin's-lane, E.C.  
**Williams, John**, Wyddfy, Llandudno, Carnarvon, Farmer. Becho & Farant, Llandudno.

### Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, May 20, 1864.

**Altan, John**, Nixon, Scarborough, Grocer. April 18. Carr. Reg May 17.  
**Barlow, John**, Kingston-upon-Hull, Merchant. April 26. Carr. Reg May 30.

Boon, Martin Jas, St John's-sq, Clerkenwell, Ironmonger. April 22. Conv. Reg May 19.

Barland, John, Oldham, Boot and Shoe Dealer. May 3. Conv. Reg May 19.

Burton, John, Whitby, York, Painter. April 21. Conv. Reg May 18.

Carne, John, Edlington, Berke, Carpenter. April 21. Comp. Reg May 18.

Clarke, Joseph, Ansty, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer. April 25. Conv. Reg May 19.

Cohen, Wm, Cow-cross-st, Smithfield, Assistant to a Dealer in Iron. May 10. Comp. Reg May 20.

Cullen, David, Bolton-le-Moors, Lancaster, Lead Pipe Manufacturer. May 12. Conv. Reg May 19.

Evans, Stephen, Troedyrhiw, Glamorgan, Grocer. April 29. Conv. Reg May 18.

Fowler, Jas, Brynmawr, Brecon, Outfitter. April 28. Conv. Reg May 9.

Gardner, Eleanor Nesbit, Park-house, Clapham-park, Schoolmistress. May 17. Conv. Reg May 19.

Hallam, John, Longton, Stafford, Beerseller. April 20. Conv. Reg May 18.

Hall, Wm, Kingston-upon-Hull, Grocer. April 30. Conv. Reg May 18.

Jamieson, Stuart, & Hy Jamieson, Whitehaven, Wood Merchants. April 21. Conv. Reg May 18.

Johnson, John Fredk, Jun, Long-alley, Skinner-st, Norton Folgate, Cabinet Maker. April 29. Comp. Reg May 19.

Kelly, Hy, Grove-st, Camden-town, Surveyor. May 16. Comp. Reg May 20.

King, Wm Wilson, Percy-st, Tottenham-court-rd, Clerk in Holy Orders. May 7. Conv. Reg May 20.

Knott, John, Eccles, Lancaster, Grocer. April 21. Conv. Reg May 19.

Livsey, Jas, Rouel-rd, Bermondsey, Builder. May 17. Release. Reg May 19.

Lugar, Francis Albert, Kingston-upon-Hull, Chemist. May 5. Comp. Reg May 19.

Robinson, Geo, & Joseph Benton, Birm, Sword Cutlers. April 21. Conv. Reg May 11.

Sawyer, Edwd, & Edwin Jones, Walbrook, Bill Brokers. April 27. Covenant. Reg May 18.

Bakewell, Robt Simpson, Fredk Southey, & Mayer Randegger, Great Tower-st, Merchants. May 12. Comp. Reg May 20.

Simpson, Wm, Jun, Dob Cross, York, Professor of Music. April 21. Conv. Reg May 19.

Spencer, Wm, Birm, Beerseller. April 25. Conv. Reg May 18.

Stokes, John, Nottingham, Grocer. April 19. Comp. Reg May 17.

Welfare, Hy, Weymouth-pl, New Kent-rd, Printer and Publisher. May 13. Comp. Reg May 18.

Whitehead, Thos, & Hy Ward, Birm, Jewellers. May 5. Asst. Reg May 17.

Wilson, Jas, Monmouth, Innkeeper. April 18. Conv. Reg May 16.

Wood, Anne Maria, Aberdare, Glamorgan. April 22. Asst. Reg May 18.

Wood, Thos, West Gorton, Manch, Grocer. April 23. Comp. Reg May 20.

TUESDAY, May 24, 1864.

Bland, John, & Jas Fletcher, Bradford, Manufacturing Chemists. April 28. Comp. Reg May 21.

Brooks, Wm, Oldswinford, Worcester, Malster. May 16. Comp. Reg May 21.

Brown, Reuben, Princes-rd, Kennington-cross, Tailor. April 29. Asst. Reg May 23.

Chichester, Arthur Geo, & Edwd Richd Lunn, Guildford, Corn Merchants. April 26. Asst. Reg May 23.

Chudleigh, Wm Hy, Phoenix-st, Soho, Pianoforte Manufacturer. April 25. Arr. Reg May 23.

Coley, Wm, Birm, Printer. May 2. Conv. Reg May 23.

Cox, Geo Hugh Augustus, Abergavenny, Monmouth, Wine Merchant. April 25. Conv. Reg May 23.

Daire, Wm, Shoplitch, Shrewsbury, Watchmaker. April 25. Conv. Reg May 20.

Davies, Ashmore, Edward-sq, Caledonian-rd, Draper. May 19. Comp. Reg May 21.

Dekins, Wm, Daventry, Northampton, Boot Manufacturer. April 28. Comp. Reg May 24.

Ellis, Robt Loring, Peterborough, Builder. April 26. Conv. Reg May 21.

Fearnley, Hy Jas, Dewsbury, York, Corn Factor. May 13. Asst. Reg May 21.

Fox, Oscar Harger, North Lodge, Kilburn, Surgeon. Nov 30. Arr. Reg May 23.

Harborne, Richd, Solihull, Warwick, Grocer. May 5. Comp. Reg May 21.

Hobson, Chas, Wimborne Minster, Dorset, Coal Merchant. April 22. Comp. Reg May 20.

Kauter, Adolph, Percy-ter, Islington, Gent. May 21. Comp. Reg May 23.

Little, Wm, Manch, Draper. April 27. Asst. Reg May 23.

Lodge, Levi, Huddersfield, Innkeeper. April 21. Conv. Reg May 19.

Mahon, Owen, Jubilee-st, Mile-end, Beerseller. May 16. Comp. Reg May 23.

Marshall, Jas Brown, Masbrough, York, Provision Dealer. May 12. Asst. Reg May 20.

McLeod, Wm, Coventry, Travelling Draper. May 10. Comp. Reg May 21.

Morrall, Jas, & Denis Halfpenny, Grange, Bermondsey, Tanner. April 21. Comp. Reg May 19.

Nelson, John, Stockton, Durham, Commercial Traveller. May 3. Conv. Reg May 23.

Perkins, Robt, Birm, Grocer. April 23. Conv. Reg May 21.

Powell, Joseph, Pembroke, Grocer. May 7. Comp. Reg May 23.

Salisbury, Joseph Geo, Portland-rd, South Norwood, Corn Dealer. May 19. Comp. Reg May 21.

Semple, Thos, Stockton-on-Tees, Travelling Draper. April 26. Asst. Reg May 23.

Smith, Wm Ford, Manch, Upholsterer. May 17. Comp. Reg May 20.

Spiers, Joseph, Burlington-rd, Paddington, Builder. May 6. Comp. Reg May 21.

Street, Atkin Smith, Sheffield, Joiner. May 2. Conv. Reg May 20.

Upton, Wm Antony, Easton-rd, Tutor. May 17. Conv. Reg May 20.

Watson, Jas, Scarborough, Grocer. April 28. Conv. Reg May 21.

White, Geo, Grafton-st, Soho, Carpenter. May 11. Comp. Reg May 23.

Williams, David, & Owen Williams, Upper Bangor, Carnarvon, Builders. May 3. Conv. Reg May 21.

Withy, Robt, Hallow, Worcester, Grocer. May 5. Conv. Reg May 20.

### Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, May 20, 1864.

To Surrender in London.

Adams, Wm Benj Thos, Smith-st, Clerkenwell, Pianoforte Tuner. Pet May 15. May 30 at 2. Marshall, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Crabb, Alf, Poole, Surgeon. Pet May 18. June 7 at 1. Skilbeck & Griffith, Bedford-row, for Aldridge & Harker, Poole.

Escudier, Stephen, The Terrace, Kensington, Surveyor. Pet May 16. June 7 at 11. Lindo & Sons, Moorgate-st.

Giraud, Andre, Little Somers-st, Aldgate, Wine Merchant. Pet May 17. June 7 at 12. Chidley, Old Jewry.

Hatton, Jesse, John-st, Lamb's Conduit-st, out of business. Pet May 17. June 7 at 11. Harrison, Basinghall-st.

Heathwaite, Jas, Grandy-st, Poplar New-town, Cheesemonger. Pet May 17. June 7 at 12. Matthews & Co, Leadenhall-st.

Hicks, Wm Peter, Hampstead-rd, Clerk. Pet May 17. May 31 at 12. Smith, Wilmington-sq.

Hussey, Hy, London-rd, Southwark, Beer Seller. Adj May 18. June 7 at 12. Aldridge.

Lambert, Alphons, Red Lion-sq, Holborn, General Agent. Pet May 13. May 31 at 12. Braham, Furnival's-inn.

Macdonald, Donald, Melton-pl, Euston-sq, Glass Stainer. Pet May 14. May 31 at 12. Marshall, Hatton-garden.

Malcolm, Hy, Long-acre, Window Glass Merchant. Pet May 18. June 7 at 12. Hill, Basinghall-st.

Menzies, Thos, Jamaica-ter, Poplar, Ship Chandler. Pet May 16. June 7 at 11. Horwood, Philpot-lane.

Poulter, Robt, Claremont-ter, South Lambeth, Clerk. Pet May 16. June 7 at 11. Stone, New-inn.

Richards, Thos Bailey, Bernard-st, Regent's-pk-rd, Gent. Pet May 16. June 7 at 11. Harrison & Lewis, Old Jewry.

Scaramanga, Sarandy Peter, Blomfield-st, Bill Broker. Pet May 16. May 31 at 12. Wells, Basinghall-st.

Stuart, Thos, Clondesley-st, Islington, Builder. Pet May 16. May 31 at 1. Grout, Scott's-yd, Bush-lane.

Watkins, Marianne, Queen's-cres West, Havestock-hill, Spinster, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet May 18. May 31 at 11. Thomas & Hollams, Mincing-lane.

Weeks, Francis Ebenezer, Croydon, Journeyman Painter. June 7 at 12. Silvester, Newington.

Young, Saml, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Tailor. Pet May 17. June 7 at 12. Urry, Newport.

To Surrender in the Country.

Adams, John, West Haddon, Northampton, Carpenter. Pet May 13. Daventry, May 25 at 10. Leake, Long Buckby.

Akerman, Joseph Pierce, Upavon, Wilts, Relieving Officer. Pet May 18. Bristol, June 3 at 11. Abbott & Co, Bristol.

Allen, Rev Chas, Bushley, Worcester, Clerk. Pet May 16. Birm, June 8 at 12. Williams & Brydges, Cheltenham, and Hodgson & Son, Birm.

Bowers, Job, and David Greenwood, Romiley, Chester, Hat Manufacturers. Pet May 17. Manch, June 7 at 12. Reddish, Manch.

Chudley, Geo, Crediton, Devon, Miller. Pet May 16. Crediton, June 2 at 11. Flook, Exeter.

Clark, Jas, Southsea, Engineer on board H.M.S. Asia. Pet May 14. Portsmouth, May 31 at 11. Paffard, Portsea.

Cockerill, Jas, Kingston-upon-Hull, Hair Dresser. Pet May 13. Kingston-upon-Hull, May 31 at 11. Summers, Hull.

Cooke, Abel, Alstone, nr Cheltenham, Market Gardener. Adj May 16. Gloucester, May 31 at 11. Boodie, Cheltenham.

Cooper, Jonathan, Salter's Wells, Stafford, Cattle Dealer. Pet May 14. Leek, May 26 at 11. Tennant, Hanley.

Coxon, Thos, Moor-green, Nottingham, Farmer. Adj May 10. Birm, May 31 at 11.

Criddie, Sarah, Taunton, Somerset, Grocer. Pet May 18. Exeter, June 1 at 12. Rossett, Taunton.

Cutts, John, Bilston, Stafford, Haberdasher. Pet May 18. Birm, June 6 at 12. Bartlett, Wolverhampton.

Davison, Thos, Wolsingham, Durham, Colliery Viewer. Pet May 13. Wolsingham, June 2 at 10. Dolphin, Walsingham.

Edwards, Hy, Sunderland, Fish Dealer. Pet May 14. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, June 2 at 12. Simey, Sunderland.

Harper, John, Wolverhampton, Butcher. Adj May 16. Birm, June 3 at 12. Kinscar, Wolverhampton.

Harwick, Hy, Wolverhampton, Provision Dealer. Pet May 17. Birm, June 6 at 12. Underhill, Wolverhampton, and Green, Birm.

Hayes, Jas Henshall, Lpool, Broker. Pet May 10. Lpool, June 2 at 11. Stone, Lpool.

Hitchmough, Saml, Garston, Lancaster, Bootmaker. Pet May 18. Lpool, June 2 at 3. Copeman, Lpool.

Ivens, Joseph, Rugby, Carpenter. Pet April 28. Rugby, May 31 at 11. Overell, Leamington.

ones, Roderick, Brecon, Saddler. Pet May 3. Bristol, June 3 at 11. Press & Inskip, Brecon.

Keene, Emma, Lpool, Widow. Pet May 10 (for pan). Lpool, May 31 at 2. Evans & Co, Lpool.

Kerridge, Benj, Brighton, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet May 16. Brighton, June 3 at 11. Mills, Brighton.

Littleton, Richd, Waterloo, Lancaster, Joiner. Pet May 16. Lpool, June 1 at 3. Ritson, Lpool.

McCandlish, John Thomson, Lpool, Comm Traveller. Adj May 11. Manch May 31 at 11. Morgan, Lpool.

Metcalfe, Richd, Malton, York, Wine Merchant. Pet May 14. Leeds, June 1 at 11. Jagger, Malton, and Bond & Darwick, Leeds.

Martin, Thos Bowden, H.M.S. Dasher, Portsmouth, Engineer. Adj May 7. Winchester, May 31 at 11. Paffard, Portsea.

Morrison, Geo, Edge-hill, Lpool, Paper Collar Manufacturer. Pet May 16. Lpool, June 1 at 8. Mason, Lpool.

Munt, Wm, Aston, Hertford, Licensed Victualler. Pet May 14. Hertford, June 3 at 11. Armstrong, Hertford.

Normanton, John, Kingston-upon-Hull, Hat Manufacturer. Pet May 13. Hull, May 31 at 12. Summers, Hull.

Pear, Thos, Bitterne, Southampton, Coachman. Pet May 16. Southampton, June 13 at 12. Mackey, Southampton.

Pence, Thos, Wotton, nr Hull, Potatoe Dealer. Adj May 13. Hull, May 31 at 1. Phillips, Hull.

Priest, Wm, Tuxford, Nottingham, Excise Officer. Pet May 17. East Retford, June 1 at 10. Marshall, Jun, East Retford.



Richardson, Joseph, Woolton, nr Liverpool, Grocer. Pet May 19. Lpool, June 3 at 11. Holden, Lpool.  
Saphin, Thos. Birm, Watchmaker. Pet May 13 (for pau). Warwick, June 6 at 10. Sargent, Birm.  
Smith, Jas, Boston, Draper. Pet May 17. June 14 at 11. Bourne & Co, Alford.  
Spencer, Rupert Percy, Birm, Journeyman Saddler. Pet May 13 (for pau). Warwick, June 6 at 10. Sargent, Argyll-chambers.  
Stallard, Hy, Cheltenham, Window Blind Manufacturer. Pet May 11. Cheltenham, May 31 at 11. Jones, Cheltenham.  
Summerton, John, Broughton Hackett, Baker. Pet May 17. Worcester, June 4 at 11. Wilson, Worcester.  
Sutcliffe, Hannah, Cheltenham, Innkeeper. Pet May 17. Cheltenham, May 31 at 11. Boodle, Cheltenham.  
Taylor, Ann, Astley Abbots, Salop, Innkeeper. Adj May 13. Shrewsbury, June 24 at 11.  
Thompson, Joseph, Leeds, Provision Dealer. Pet May 18. Leeds, June 8 at 11. North & Sons, Leeds.  
Tucker, Richd, Hayne, Devon, Cowkeeper. Pet May 17. Tiverton, May 31 at 11.  
Warne, John, Littlehampton, Sussex, Painter. Pet May 18. Arundel, June 7 at 10. Lamb, Brighton.  
Winward, Ralph, Little Bolton, Lancaster, Operative Cotton Spinner. Pet May 18. Bolton, June 1 at 10. Richardson & Brandwood, Bolton.  
Wood, Joseph Ray, Cross Pipes, York, Butcher. Pet May 20. Holmfirth, June 13 at 10. Freeman, Huddersfield.

TUESDAY, May 24, 1864.

To Surrender in London.

Adcock, Wm, Peerless-pl, Shoreditch, Dealer in Fruit. Adj May 19. June 13 at 11. Aldridge.  
Amery, Saml, Durham-ter, North Peckham, Builder. Pet May 23. June 4 at 11. Gregson, Angel-ct, Throgmorton-st.  
Andrews, John Mann, Earl-st, Westminster, Publican. Adj May 19. June 13 at 11. A. J. Kibbarn, Builder. Pet May 19. June 7 at 1. Bramwell, Scott's-yard, Bush-lane.  
Brown, Fras, Jun, Gt Yarmouth, Dealer in Fish. Adj May 19. June 13 at 11. Aldridge.  
Burns, Richd, Forest-rd, Dalston, Skirt Manufacturer. Adj May 19. June 13 at 11. Aldridge.  
Burrell, Geo Hy, King's Lynn, Currier. Pet May 20. June 4 at 12. Wilkin, Lynn.  
Carriek, Geo, New North-rd, Islington, Hair Manufacturer. Pet May 18. June 7 at 12. Mason & Co, Gresham-st.  
Chappell, John Wm, Connaught-ter, Paddington, Solicitor. Pet May 19. June 7 at 12. Young, Delamere-ter, Paddington.  
Cooper, Jas Bailey, Talbot-ter, Bayswater, Clerk. Pet May 19. June 4 at 12. Preston & Dorman, Gresham-st.  
Cragg, Joseph Cowper, Marylebone-rd, Comm Agent. Adj May 19. June 13 at 11. Aldridge.  
Denton, Wm, Chase-side, Southgate, Carman. Pet May 20. June 7 at 1. Todd, Newgate-st.  
Elliott, Emma, Richmond-ter, Bayswater, Spinster, Cutler. Pet May 20. June 7 at 2. Elean & Hocombe, Bedford-row.  
Escudier, Stephen, The Terrace, Kensington, Gent. Pet May 16. June 7 at 11. Lindo & Sons, Moorgate-st.  
Farman, Hy, Blackheath-rd, Fruiterer. Pet May 20. June 7 at 1. Ody, Southwark.  
Foster, John Ashwood, Paradise-pl, Bow, Beerseller. Pet May 21. June 7 at 1. Lewis, Hackney-rd.  
Fryer, Richd, jun, Wathamstow, Contractor. Pet May 21. June 7 at 1. Freyler, Coleman-st.  
Grainger, Alf, Finsbury-crescent, Camberwell, Grocer. Adj May 18. June 7 at 2. Aldridge.  
Hordern, Hugh Jas, Williamson's Hotel, Bow lane, Cheapside, Salesman. Adj May 19. June 13 at 11. Aldridge.  
Johnson, John, Manchester-st, Manchester-sq, Cab Proprietor. Pet May 16. June 4 at 12. Pain, Marylebone-rd.  
Laing, Jas Wm, Lewisham, Attorney's Clerk. Adj May 18. June 13 at 12. Aldridge.  
Lane, John Hy, East Greenwich, Licensed Victualler. Pet May 19. June 7 at 2. Paddison, New Boswell-ct.  
Mayers, Hy Isaac, Cleveland-st, Mile End, Tailor. Adj May 19. June 13 at 12. Aldridge.  
Wemyss, Wm McKenzie Wyllie, Old-st, St Luke's, Draper. Pet May 20. June 14 at 11. Parker & Co, St Paul's-churchyard.  
Moody, Wm, Greenwich, Basket Maker. Adj May 18. June 7 at 1. Aldridge.  
Murphy, Wm, Oakley-cres South, Manor-st, Comb Manufacturer. Pet May 19. June 7 at 1. Munday, Essex-st.  
Neale, Robt, Pigott-street, Limehouse, Accountant. Pet May 18. June 7 at 2. Fisher, Camberwell New-rd.  
Parnell, Geo Thos, Wardour-st, Soho, Engineer. Adj May 19. June 13 at 12. Aldridge.  
Piggios, Chas Skeels, Church-lane, Whitechapel, Saw and Tool Maker. Pet May 19. June 7 at 1. Mardon, Newgate-st.  
Powling, Fredk, Hornchurch, Essex, Baker. Pet May 20. June 7 at 2. Preston & Dorman, Gresham-st.  
Ray, David, King-st, Portman-sq, Cheesemonger's Assistant. Pet May 20. June 4 at 11. Croft, Mark-lane.  
Slagg, Robt, Romford, Draper. Pet May 18. June 4 at 12. Rooks, Moorgate-st.  
Surridge, Tom, Coventry-st, Licensed Victualler. Pet May 20. June 4 at 12. Baddley & Son, Lemon-st.  
Triggs, Thos John, Richmond-grove, Islington, Journeyman Printer. Pet May 19. June 4 at 11. Wright, Chancery-lane.  
Wells, Lewis, Gt Peter-st, Westminster, Boot Maker. Adj May 19. June 13 at 12. Aldridge.  
Wickens, Josiah Ford, Coupland-ter, Plumstead, Carpenter. Pet May 19. June 7 at 12. Lewis & Lewis, Ely-pl.  
Withers, Hy Spencer, Chipping Norton, Oxford, Clothier. Pet May 20. June 7 at 1. Beard, Basinghall-st.

To Surrender in the Country.

Billyeald, Thos, jun, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. Pet May 19. Nottingham, June 13 at 11. Heathcote, Nottingham.

Burden, Wm Chesterton, Leicester, Dealer in Musical Instruments. Pet May 19. Leicester, June 4 at 10.30. Chamberlain, Leicester.  
Burnett, Jas, Handsworth, Stafford, Engineer. Pet May 19. Birm, June 10 at 12. Allen, Birm.  
Clowes, Jeremiah, Rudgway, Gloucester. Adj May 18. Gloucester, June 3 at 12.  
Colenutt, Abraham, Isle of Wight, Carpenter. Pet May 18. Newport, June 4 at 11. Beckingale, Newport.  
Collins, Thurston, Sheerness, Hants, Clerk. Pet May 21. Shoemess, June 11 at 11. Hayward, Rochester.  
Dickens, Francis, Chipping Ongar, Essex, Organist. Pet May 20. Brentwood, June 9 at 3. Preston & Dorman, Gresham-st.  
Dyer, David, Llandilo-fawr, Carmarthen, Shoemaker. Pet May 21. Llandilo-fawr, June 6 at 11. Jefferies, Carmarthen.  
Giles, Thos, Cardiff, Haulier. Pet May 11. Bristol, June 3 at 11. Ensor, Cardiff, and Abbot & Co, Bristol.  
Halstead, Geo, Bentham, York, Butter Dealer. Adj May 13. Settle, June 3 at 10.  
Hobbs, Harriet, St Blazey, Cornwall. Adj May 10. St Austell, June 7 at 11.  
Hopton, Richd, Hereford, Architect. Pet May 19. Hereford, June 13 at 10. Averill, Hereford.  
Hussell, Thos, Ilfracombe, Devon, Builder. Pet May 14. Exeter, June 3 at 11. Chanter & Finch, Barnstaple, and Clarke, Exeter.  
Jacob, Philip, Birm. Adj May 18. Birm, June 6 at 10.  
Kennedy, Jas, Newark-upon-Trent, Tea Dealer. Pet May 19. Newark, June 1 at 11. Ashley, Newark-upon-Trent.  
King, John, & Joseph King, Burnley, Lancaster, Manufacturers. Pet May 20. Manceh, June 7 at 12. Cobbett & Wheeler, Manceh.  
Lane, Saml W, Wolverhampton, Factor. Pet May 10. Birm, June 3 at 12. Underhill, Wolverhampton, and Green, Birm.  
Ludlow, Thos, Birm, Journeyman Butcher. Pet May 19. Birm, June 6 at 10. Duke, Birm.  
Luff, John, Northchapel, Sussex, Blacksmith. Pet May 16. Petworth, June 6 at 10. White, Guildford.  
Mackay, Joseph, Bristol, Confectioner. Pet May 18. Bristol, June 3 at 12. Hill.  
McKinnless, John, Manceh, Provision Dealer. Pet May 20. Manceh, June 6 at 9.30.  
Muldoon, Jas, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Fruiterer. Adj May 10. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, June 3 at 11. Hoyle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.  
Moorey, Sarah, Gloucester, Widow, Ironmonger. Pet May 18. Bristol, June 3 at 11. Press & Inskip, Bristol.  
Porter, Jas, Lpool, Licensed Victualler. Pet May 20. Lpool, June 6 at 11. Francis & Almond, Lpool.  
Rendall, John, and Danl Brake, Henstridge, Somerset, Coal Merchants. Pet May 12. Bristol, June 3 at 11. Murly, Bristol.  
Roebuck, Chas, Gt Limber, Lincoln, Blacksmith. Adj May 10 (for pau). Caistor, June 6 at 12. Brown & Son, Lincoln.  
Rynman, Thos, Bellon, Lincoln, out of business. Pet May 18. Thorne, June 8 at 3. Woodhead, Doncaster.  
Sanders, John, jun, Hemlington, nr Middlesborough, Farmer. Pet May 21. Leeds, June 8 at 11. Sowerby, Stokeley, and Bond & Barwick, Leeds.  
Scott, Jas, Bath, Boot Maker. Pet May 17. Bath, June 6 at 11. Bartrum, Bath.  
Selwyn, Selwyn, Gloucester, Cattle Dealer. Pet May 18. Newnham, June 6 at 12. Hulls, Gloucester.  
Sherwin, Edwd, Croxton Kenal, Leicester, Tailor. Pet May 11. Grantham, June 4 at 10.  
Steeple, John, Hoyland, nr Barnsley, Colliery Underviewer. Pet May 20. Barnsley, June 6 at 10. Mason, York.  
Stradling, Wm, Easton, Bristol, Baker. Adj May 18. Bristol, June 3 at 11.  
Thomas, Edwd, Fowry, Cornwall, Rope Maker. Pet May 13. Exeter, June 3 at 11. Edmunds & Sons, Plymouth, and Flood, Exeter.  
Thurlow, Hy, St Cuthbert's, Norfolk, Tailor. Pet May 20. Thetford, June 17 at 11. Walpole, Northwold.  
Walker, Joseph, Birm, Huckster. Pet. Birm, June 6 at 10.  
Webb, Richd Avers, Gloucester, Pork Butcher. Adj May 16. Bristol, June 3 at 11.  
White, Wm, West Hartlepool, Timber Merchant. Pet May 18. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, June 3 at 11.30. Brignall, Durham.  
Woodroff, Chas, Chesterfield, Tailor. Pet May 21. Chesterfield, June 14 at 11. Gratton, Chesterfield.  
Worth, Wm, Torquay, Carter. Pet May 19. Newton Abbott, June 3 at 11. Baker, Newton Bushell.  
Wright, Joseph, Stockton-on-the-Forest, nr York, Farmer. Adj May 13. Leeds, June 8 at 11.  
Wright, Saml, Sheffield, Saw Maker. Pet May 20. Sheffield, June 8 at 1. Micklethwaite, Sheffield.  
Yeoman, Eliz, Penketh, Lancaster, Farmer. Pet May 13. Warrington, June 9 at 12. Day & Wood, Warrington.

### Stotch Sequestrations.

FRIDAY, May 20, 1864.

Carmichael, Jas, Edinburgh, Poulterer. Seq May 14. Meeting, May 23 at 12. Dowell's rooms, Edinburgh.  
Dickson, Jas, Stotfalls, Monkrie, Farmer. Seq May 17. Meeting, May 20 at 12. Royal Hotel, Dundee.  
Dunlop, John, Fraserburgh, Auctioneer. Seq May 14. Meeting, May 23 at 12. Saltoun Arms Hotel, Fraserburgh.  
Gillon, David, & Ross Shiells, Fountainbridge, Sacking Manufacturer. Seq May 14. May 24 at 3. Dowell's rooms, Edinburgh.  
Marr, John Belahay, Ferry-rd, nr Edinburgh, Builder. Seq May 17. Meeting, May 24 at 2. Dowell's rooms, Edinburgh.

TUESDAY, May 24, 1864.

Anderson, Wm, Craigbank, nr Avenbridge, Stirling, Builder. Seq May 20. Meeting, May 31 at 3. Red Lion Hotel, Falkirk.  
Jardine, Andrew, Greenock, Archibald Jardine, & Marion Jardine, Alexandria, Partners of the Netherfield Coal Company. Seq May 19. Meeting, May 30 at 12. Faculty Hall, Glasgow.  
Shearer, Alex, Dunipace, Stirling, Miller. Seq May 19. Meeting, June 2 at 1. Crown Inn, Falkirk.  
Skene, Thos, Dundee, Eating-house Keeper. Seq May 19. Meeting, May 30 at 1. British Hotel, Castle-st, Dundee.

## ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

## AT THE MART.

May 20.—By Mr. FRANK LEWIS.  
Leasehold, 2 houses, being Nos. 1 and 2, Prince's-terrace, Starch-green, Hammermith; term, 99 years from March, 1843, at a ground-rent of £5 each house—Sold for £600.

Leasehold, 2 houses, being Nos. 3 and 4, Prince's-terrace; held for a similar term and ground-rent as above—Sold for £665.

Freehold plot of building land, containing 3a. 1r. 35p., fronting the road leading from Walton station to Moulsey, Surrey—Sold for £800.

Plot of freehold building land, containing 3a. 0r. 10p., fronting the New-road, adjoining the above—Sold for £900.

Freehold 2 plots of building land, fronting the New-road, and containing about 10 acres—Sold for £2,260.

May 23.—By Messrs. CHARLTON.  
Freehold hop and fruit farm, containing 23½ acres, known as Warton-hill, situate at Boughton, Winchelsea, Kent, with farm-house, 5 cottages, and agricultural buildings—Sold for £3,000.

Policy of assurance for £600, effected with the Equitable Assurance Company, on the life of a gentleman aged 73 years—Sold for £590.

Policy of assurance for £4,000, effected with the Guardian Assurance Company, on the life of a gentleman aged 80 years—Sold for £2,830.

Policy of assurance for £3,000, effected with the Guardian Assurance Company, on the life of a gentleman aged 73 years—Sold for £940.

Policy of assurance for £4,000, effected with the Crown Assurance Company, on the life of a gentleman aged 64 years—Sold for £1,166.

Policy of assurance for £300, effected with the Licensed Victuallers' Assurance Company, on the life of a gentleman aged 50 years—Sold for £75.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.  
Freehold and copyhold, 21 acres of arable land, situate in Broomstick-hall, common, Waltham, Essex—Sold for £1,500.

Copyhold property, known as The Barracks, situate in High-st., Homerton, comprising 2 dwelling-houses with shops, producing £50 per annum—Sold for £460.

Copyhold, dwelling-house and shop, situate as above; producing £61 2s. per annum—Sold for £420.

Copyhold plot of building-land, with cow-houses and piggeries, fronting Alderman's-walk, Homerton—Sold for £115.

Copyhold plot of building-land, fronting the proposed New-road, Homerton—Sold for £80.

Copyhold plot of building-land, fronting the proposed New-road, Homerton—Sold for £80.

Freehold dwelling-house and shop, situate in High-street, Homerton; let at £23 per annum—Sold for £450.

Freehold dwelling-house, situate No. 15, High-street, aforesaid; let at a rental amounting to £26 per annum—Sold for £260.

Leasehold, 2 tenements, situate No. 9, Thomas-street, and No. 21, Hockley-street, Homerton; producing £22 2s. per annum; held for an unexpired term of 19 years, at a ground-rent of £7 7s. per annum—Sold for £75.

May 24.—Messrs. DANIEL SMITH, SON, & OAKLEY.  
Freehold residence, known as Mill-cottage, situate on the new road from London to Woodford, Essex, containing, with paddock, gardens, and pleasure-grounds, nearly 3 acres—Sold for £2,425.

By Messrs. DEBENHAM & TESSON.  
Freehold dwelling-house, known as Nos. 9 and 10, Brown's-lane, New Commercial-street, Spitalfields—Sold for £800.

Leasehold, 2 houses, with shops, known as Nos. 1 and 2, Queen's-terrace, Brunswick-road, Camberwell; held for a term of 61 years from Christmas, 1851; apportioned ground-rent, £8 per annum; producing £51 per annum—Sold for £795.

Leasehold, 3 houses, known as 3, 4, and 5, Queen's-terrace aforesaid; held for a similar term as above; apportioned ground-rent, £10 per annum; producing £70 4s. per annum—Sold for £450.

Leasehold, 2 houses, being Nos. 9 and 10, Brown's-lane, Spitalfields; held for an unexpired term of 14 years, at a ground-rent of £30 per annum—Sold for £15.

By Mr. JONAS FAXTON.  
Freehold residence, known as Mount House, situate at Enfield, Middlesex, —Sold for £3,400.

Freehold enclosure of accommodation land, containing 4a. 38p., situate as above—Sold for £1,460.

Freehold, 2 enclosures of pasture land, containing 10a. 3r. 26p., situate as above—Sold for £2,100.

Freehold enclosure of pasture land, containing 4a. 0r. 18p., situate as above—Sold for £980.

Freehold, 2 cottages, garden, and premises, containing 22p., situate as above—Sold for £350.

By Messrs. FENN, COOK, & FENN.  
Freehold estate, consisting of a farm, known as Boydon Hall, situate in the parish of Ramsey, Essex, comprising a residence, two cottages, and agricultural buildings, containing 273a. 3r. 4p. of arable, pasture, and wood land—Sold for £14,500.

Freehold enclosure of arable land, situate as above, and containing 2a. 0r. 6p.—Sold for £100.

The great tithes arising from the Stour Hall Estate, situate in the parish of Ramsey, Essex, commuted at £32 17s. 6d. per annum—Sold for £630.

The great tithes arising from Rochester Farm, situate as above, commuted at £23 12s. 6d. per annum—Sold for £470.

The great tithes arising from lands in the parish of Dovercourt, Essex, commuted at £11 19s. 10d. per annum—Sold for £225.

50 £10 shares in the Royal Farmers and General Life and Fire Insurance Company—Sold for £1 17s. per share.

50 £10 shares in the Royal Farmers and General Life and Fire Insurance Company—Sold for £1 19s. per share.

50 £10 shares in the Royal Farmers and General Life and Fire Insurance Company—Sold for £2 1s. per share.

50 £10 shares in the Royal Farmers and General Life and Fire Insurance Company—Sold for £2 4s. per share.

May 26.—By Messrs. DANN & SON.  
Freehold residence, known as Heath Close House, situate at Dartford-heath, Kent, with pleasure-grounds, orchard, &c., comprising about 14 acres—Sold for £6,000.

Freehold pleasure farm, containing about 42 acres, adjoining the above—Sold for £4,550.

Leasehold estate, comprising about 9 acres of plantation and arable land,

together with six cottages, situate at Morne, near Cobham, Kent; held for a term of 500 years from 1755, at a peppercorn rent, and let for a term expiring in 1874, at £55 per annum—Sold for £1,060.

By Messrs. TEAS, BROTHERS.  
Leasehold, 4 shops, situate in Molden-road, Kentish-town; term, 99 years from March, 1863; ground-rent, £24; let for £160 per annum—Sold for £1,100.

Leasehold shop and dwelling-house, No. 9, Haro'd-street, Molden-road; term, 99 years from June, 1863; ground-rent, £3 10s.; let at £40 per annum—Sold for £355.

Leasehold, the Bricklayers' Arms ale and stout house, Tonbridge-street, Euston-road, King's-cross—Sold for £295.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday next, June 2.—An Absolute Reversion to £2,750 Consols: life 65.

**MR. MARSH** has received instructions to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY next, JUNE 2, at TWELVE, the valuable ABSOLUTE REVERSION to a ONE-FOURTH PART of the SUM of £11,000 Consols, receivable on the decease or second marriage of a lady now in the sixty-fifth year of her age.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart: of Messrs. LINDSAY & MASON, Solicitors, 84, Basinghall-street; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday next, June 2.

**MR. MARSH** has received instructions to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY next, JUNE 2, at TWELVE, the ABSOLUTE REVERSION to a ONE-FOURTH PART of the TWO SUMS of £1,179 11s. 9d. and £314 6s. 3d. Consols, receivable on the decease or second marriage of a lady now in the 65th year of her age.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart: of Messrs. LINDSAY & MASON, Solicitors, 84, Basinghall-street; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday next, June 2.—A Policy for £4,000 in the Law Life Office, on the life of W. Harris, Esq., late of Rugby, Solicitor.

**MR. MARSH** has received instructions to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY next, JUNE 2, at TWELVE, a very valuable POLICY of ASSURANCE for £4,000, effected in February, 1860, with the Law Life Assurance Society, Fleet-street, on the life of a gentleman now in his 48th year. A bonus will be declared at the end of this year, which, it is anticipated, will be very considerable, and the next premium will not be due until February, 1865.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart: of ALBERT DIXON, Esq., Solicitor, 10, Bedford-row; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday next, June 2.

**MR. MARSH** has received instructions to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY next, JUNE 2, at TWELVE, the ABSOLUTE REVERSION to a ONE-EIGHTH PART of SHARE of the SUM of £2,000, receivable on the decease of a lady and gentleman, aged respectively 61 and 67 years.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart: of Messrs. CHILTON, BURTON, YEATES, & HART, Solicitors, No. 25, Chancery-lane; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday next, June 2.—Atlantic and St. Lawrence Railway Company's Debentures.

**MR. MARSH** has received instructions to include in his next monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY next, JUNE 2, at TWELVE, in Three Lots, THREE DEBENTURES of £500 each, bearing interest at six per cent., of the Atlantic and St. Lawrence Railway Company, leased to the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart: and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday next, June 2.—A Freehold Ground-rent of £6 per annum.

**MR. MARSH** has received instructions to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY next, JUNE 2, at TWELVE, a FREEHOLD GROUND-RENT of £6 per annum, amply secured upon Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, Cannon-cottages, near the Horse Baracks, Heston, Hounslow, the rack rentals of which amount to £41 8s. per annum. Particulars may be obtained at the Mart: of Messrs. HAWKINS, BLOXAM, PATTERSON, & POWER, Solicitors, 2, New Bowell-court, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn, E.C.; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday next, June 2.

**MR. MARSH** has received instructions from the Executors and Trustees of the will of the late W. G. Watson, Esq., to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY next, JUNE 2, at TWELVE, a CHARGE of £109 0s. 9d., with £4 6s. 8d. by way of interest thereon, in lieu of Land-tax Redeemed, secured upon Nos. 46 and 47, Castle-street, Southwark, and property adjoining, the rack rentals of which are estimated at £90 per annum.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart: of Messrs. BRIDGER & COLLINS, Solicitors, 37, King William-street; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday next, June 2.

**MR. MARSH** has received instructions to include in his next monthly periodical SALE of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY next, JUNE 2, at TWELVE, o'clock, a valuable old POLICY of ASSURANCE, for the sum of £500, effected in 1837, with the General Life Assurance Society, on the life of a gentleman, now in his 64th year. Annual premium £18 3s.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart: and at Mr. MARSH'S offices, No. 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday next, June 2.

**MR. MARSH** has received instructions to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY next, JUNE 2, at TWELVE, the ABSOLUTE REVERSION in FOUR-SIXTH PARTS or SHARE of a MOIETY of the SUM of £2,000 Consols, also in Four-Fifth Parts of another One-Sixth Share in the said Moiety, receivable on the decease of a gentleman aged 79 in July next.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart: of Messrs. HARRISONS, Solicitors, 5, Walbrook; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday next, June 2.

**MR. MARSH** has received instructions to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY next, JUNE 2, at TWELVE, a GOVERNMENT GRANT or BOUNTY of 160 acres of LAND, to be located in any part of the unsettled lands in the United States of America.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart: and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Periodical Sale (established in 1843) of Reversions, Policies, Annuities, Shares, Bonds, &c., for Thursday next, June 2.

**MR. MARSH** has received instructions to include in his next Monthly Periodical Sale of Reversions, Policies, &c., appointed to take place at the MART, on THURSDAY next, JUNE 2, at TWELVE, in Four Lots, ONE HUNDRED 23 SHARES (£2 3s. per share called and paid) in the London Parcels' Delivery Company (Limited). These shares have paid for the last six years an average dividend of about 114 per cent.

Particulars may be obtained at the Mart: and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Cornwall.—A valuable Freehold Estate of about 400 acres, situate in the parish of Gwihian, near Camborne.

**MR. MARSH** has received instructions to SELL by AUCTION, at CROUCH'S HOTEL, CAMBORNE, CORNWALL, on THURSDAY, JUNE 23, at TWO o'clock, in Six Lots, the MOIETY of a valuable FREEHOLD ESTATE, comprising a capital farm, with farmhouse and all requisite outbuildings, situate in the parish of Gwihian, about five miles from Camborne, a first-class station on the West Cornwall Railway, and about midway between Truro and Penzance; a public-house, known as the Farmer's Arms Inn, with outbuildings and gardens; a cottage and garden, a freehold property, known as the British Arsenic Works, a cottage and five enclosures of pasture and arable land, a detached cottage and three plots of land; the whole containing upwards of 400 acres, and producing rentals amounting to £225 3s. per annum.

May be viewed by permission of the tenants, and particulars of sale, with plans attached, obtained on the premises; at the place of sale; of H. DINN, Esq., Solicitor, 40, King street, Cheap-side; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, 2, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Preliminary.—Important and desirable Freehold Estates, situate at Nun-eaton and Attleborough, in the county of Warwick: comprising four dairy farms in a high state of cultivation, valuable coal mines, stone quarry, pottery, tile and brick works, building and accommodation land, public house, and other property, extending to upwards of 1,200 acres, in a ring fence. The present inadequate rental is £2,350 per annum; also a moiety of the manors of Nun-eaton and Attleborough.

**MR. MARSH** has been favoured with instructions from the Trustees of the Aston Estates Act, 1863, to prepare for SALE by AUCTION, in the early part of JULY, in numerous Lots, valuable and important FREEHOLD PROPERTY, distinguished as the Nun-eaton and Attleborough Estates: comprising four capital dairy farms, in a high state of cultivation, containing upwards of 1,000 acres of rich productive, arable and pasture land, with residences, and all requisite agricultural buildings, in important coal seams; also two of the finest brick and the fields and pottery works in the county, contiguous to, and one having an extensive frontage to, the Coventry Canal; a stone quarry, communicating by tramways to the canal; building and accommodation land; the Double Plough Inn, house adjoining, and other property. The entire estate extends to upwards of 1,200 acres, and the present inadequate rental is about £2,350 per annum. The four dairy farms will be submitted in separate lots, and offer to trustees and capitalists investments of a first-class character. The accommodation and building land and remainder of the property will be divided into convenient lots. The brick, tile, and pottery fields are acknowledged to be the best in the county, and are extensively used throughout England, railway and water carriage being so immediately contiguous.

Detailed advertisements will shortly appear, and particulars, with conditions of sale, with plan annexed, may be obtained in due course of Messrs. NICHOLSON & HERBERT, Solicitors, Spring-gardens; of A. WELLS, Esq., Solicitor, Founders'-hall, St. Swin's-lane; of Messrs. FIELD & BIGGOLD, Solicitors, Norwich; of Messrs. REYNOLDS & PALMER, Solicitors, Yarmouth; of Messrs. HODDINGS, TOWNSEND, & LEE, Solicitors, Salisbury; of H. RADFORD, Esq., Solicitor, Atherton, Warwickshire; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.

Preliminary.—Hertfordshire.—A Family Mansion and Land, with possession.

**MR. MARSH** has been favoured with instructions to prepare for SALE by AUCTION, in the ensuing Summer (unless previously disposed of by private contract), an attractive RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY, most delightfully situate at Little Berkhamstead, four miles from Hertford, and five from the Hatfield Railway Station on the Great Northern Railway: comprising a family mansion, standing in a finely-timbered park of nearly 45 acres, with coach-house, stabling, and out-buildings, pleasure grounds, kitchen gardens, convenient farm buildings, and 25 acres of arable and meadow land.

Particulars, with plans attached, are in the course of preparation, and may shortly be had, with cards to view, of Messrs. LONGMORE, SWORDELL, & LONGMORE, Solicitors, Hertford; and at Mr. MARSH'S Offices, Charlotte-row, Mansion-house.



# Equity and Law Life Assurance Society,

18, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.

CAPITAL—ONE MILLION, FULLY SUBSCRIBED.

## DIRECTORS.

CHAIRMAN—NASSAU W. SENIOR, Esq., late Master in Chancery.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—GEORGE LAKE RUSSELL, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

JOHN EDWARD ARMSTRONG, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.  
HENRY WM. BIRCH, Esq., Solicitor (Birch & Ingram).  
HENRY FOX BRISTOWE, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.  
R. J. P. BROUGHTON, Esq., Solicitor (White, Broughton, & White).  
JOHN M. CLABON, Esq., Solicitor (Fearon & Clabon).  
ANTHONY CLEASBY, Esq., Q.C.  
JOHN ELLIS CLOWES, Esq., Solicitor (Clowes & Hickley).  
CHARLES J. DIMOND, Esq., Solicitor (Simpson & Dimond).  
SIMON DUNNING, Esq., Solicitor (Burder & Dunning).  
JOHN W. HAWKINS, Esq., Solicitor (Hawkins, Bloxam, & Hawkins).  
WILLIAM E. HILLIARD, Esq., Solicitor (Hilliard, Dale, & Stretton).  
N. HOLLINGSWORTH, Esq., Solicitor (Hollingsworth & Tyerman).  
THOMAS HUGHES, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

JOHN ILIFFE, Esq., Solicitor (Cardale, Iliffe, & Russell).  
THOMAS GLOVER KENSIT, Esq., Clerk to Skinners' Company.  
CHARLES HENRY MOORE, Esq., Solicitor, 7, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
EDMUND F. MOORE, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.  
WILLIAM BENFORD NELSON, Esq., Solicitor (Park & W. B. Nelson).  
FREDERICK PEAKE, Esq., Solicitor (Barker, Bowker, & Peake).  
SIR ROBERT J. PHILLIMORE, Q.C., the Queen's Advocate.  
GEORGE W. K. POTTER, Esq., Secondary of London.  
W. B. S. RACKHAM, Esq., Solicitor, 46, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
GEORGE ROBINS, Esq., Solicitor (Warry, Robins, & Burges).  
ALFRED H. SHADWELL, Esq., Taxing Master in Chancery.  
RICHARD SMITH, Esq., Solicitor (Richd. & W. B. Smith).

Solicitor.—GEORGE ROOPER, Esq., 26, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

NINE-TENTHS of the Total Profits are divided among the Assured. Considerably more than one-tenth of the Profits is derived from Policies which do not participate in the Profits, so that THE ASSURED HAVE LARGER BONUSES THAN IF THEY FORMED A MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY, and received the whole of the Profits derived from their own Policies.

The last BONUS averaged about SIXTY PER CENT. on the Premiums paid, and TWO PER CENT. PER ANNUM on the sums assured.

THE EXPENSES of Management are less than FIVE PER CENT. on the Income.

THE PREMIUMS are calculated for every half-year of age.

The Policies of this Society, in the hands of third parties, are not vitiated by SUICIDE, or by the life assured proceeding beyond the limits allowed.

NOTICES of ASSIGNMENT of Policies registered and acknowledged free of charge. Printed forms for such notices furnished when required.

The usual Commission allowed to Solicitors introducing Insurances, the Commission being continued to the person originally entitled to it, as long as the policy remains in force, through whatever channel the premium may be paid.

LOANS granted on the Society's Policies, on Reversions, Life Interests, and other approved security.

The Annual Reports and full Statements of Account are regularly printed, and may be obtained on application.

T. B. SPRAGUE, *Actuary and Secretary.*

Freehold and Leasehold Ground-rents, amounting together to about £192 per annum.

**MESSRS. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST** have received instructions to offer for SALE, at the MART, on FRIDAY, JUNE 10, at TWELVE, in Lots, a variety of small FREEHOLD and short LEASEHOLD GROUND-RENTS, amounting together to £192 per annum, secured upon properties situate in William's-court and Pitt's-place, Great Guildford-street; New-street, Horseferry; London-road; Apollo-buildings, East-street and Manor-place, Walworth; West-square, Southwark; and Devonshire-street, Mile-end; a detailed statement of which will appear in the particulars.

May be viewed, and particulars had of  
H. STURMY, Esq., Solicitor, Hibernia-chambers, London-bridge; at the Mart; and of Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST, 62, Old Broad-street, Royal Exchange, E.C.

Freehold and Leasehold Properties, producing about £735 per annum.

**MESSRS. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST** have received instructions to offer for SALE, at the MART, on FRIDAY, JUNE 10, at TWELVE, in Lots, a variety of small FREEHOLD and short LEASEHOLD PROPERTIES, situate in William's-court and Pitt's-place, Great Guildford-street; East-street, Walworth; New Kent-road; Pitt-street, St. George's-road; St. George's-place, Walworth-road; Apollo-buildings, East-street, Walworth; Walworth Common; and Portland-place, Clapham-road, the whole in the occupation of various tenants, at rents producing together a gross income of about £735 per annum; also two Copyhold Houses situate in Market-place, Wimslow, Bucks, producing £33 per annum.

May be viewed and particulars had at the Elephant and Castle, Newington-butts; of

H. STURMY, Esq., Solicitor, Hibernia-chambers, London-bridge; at the Mart; and of Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TRIST, 62, Old Broad-street, Royal Exchange, E.C.

**ESTATES AND HOUSES, Country and Town**  
Residences, Landed Estates, Investments, Hunting Seats, Fishing and Shooting Quarters, Manors, &c.—JAMES BEAL'S REGISTER of the above, published on the 1st of each month, forwarded per post, or may be had on application at the Office, 209, Piccadilly, W.—Particulars for insertion should be forwarded not later than the 25th of each month.

Valuable old Policy in the Economic, by order of the Executors of the late Thomas Masheter, Esq.

**MESSRS. DEBENHAM & TEWSON** will SELL, at the MART, on TUESDAY, JUNE 7, at TWELVE, a valuable OLD POLICY of ASSURANCE for the sum of £1,000, effected in the year 1844 with the Economic Office, New Bridge-street, Blackfriars, on the life of a gentleman, now aged 54. The annual premium is £25 9s. 2d., and the holder of the policy is entitled to a participation in the profits of the office.

Particulars of  
Messrs. COVERDALE, LEA, COLLYER, BRISTOW, & WITHERS, Solicitors, 4, Bedford-row; and of the Auctioneers, No. 80, Cheapside.

Wimbledon.—Remarkably choice sites for the erection of first-class Mansions and Villas.—The beautiful Estate formerly attached to the residence of Lord Cottenham (now removed), comprising the magnificently timbered Cottenham-park, grounds, and gardens, situate on the south-west slope of one of the most commanding hills in the county of Surrey, and affording opportunities that cannot elsewhere be equalled for a gentleman who may wish to combine all the advantages of modern residences upon ancient, well-matured grounds in one of the most beautiful districts near London.

**MESSRS. DEBENHAM & TEWSON** are instructed to SELL, at the MART, on TUESDAY, JUNE 7, at TWELVE, in 17 lots, varying from three-quarters of an acre to 64 acres each (unless an acceptable offer be previously made), the very valuable and most beautiful FREEHOLD ESTATE, known as Cottenham-park, comprising nearly 40 acres of magnificently timbered grass land, having the important advantages of a dry gravelly subsoil, an abundance of fine water, extensive frontages to good roads, contiguity to a church, ready accessibility from London by rail, being only about seven miles drive from Hyde-park, and within a few minutes' ride by a railway, which will very soon be extended to Cannon-street, City, and situation and scenery that certainly cannot be surpassed, and is but seldom equalled even in this beautiful and highly favoured district.

Particulars (now ready) of  
Messrs. FRESHFIELDS & NEWMAN, Solicitors, 5, Bank-buildings; and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside.

Surrey-hills.—Beautiful Building Sites, forming the first portion of the Kenley-park Estate, adjoining the Kenley Station, only a mile from the Caterham Junction Station on the main line of the London and Brighton and South-Eastern Railway, and four miles from Croydon.

**MESSRS. DEBENHAM & TEWSON** have received instructions to offer for SALE, at the MART, on TUESDAY, JUNE 21, in lots, varying from 1 to 10 acres or more in extent, the FIRST PORTION of the KENLEY-PARK ESTATE, comprising about 110 acres, offering some of the most attractive sites for building, within 14 miles of London, the situation being one of the most healthy on the range the Surrey-hills, the soil and climate remarkably dry, the air pure and invigorating, and the surrounding scenery of singular beauty. The land will be divided into lots to suit the requirements of gentlemen desirous of building detached houses for their own occupation, with sufficient land to enable them to enjoy the retirement of the country combined with the advantages of ready access to the metropolis. The whole is freehold and land-tax redeemed.

Particulars, with plans (shortly), of  
Messrs. JOHNSTONE, FARQUHAR, & LEECH, Solicitors, 65, Moor-gate-street; and of Messrs. DEBENHAM & TEWSON, 80, Cheapside.

## BROOKS & SCHALLER'S AUCTION SALES

of Estates, Houses, Ground-Rents, Reversions, Annuities, Advowsons, &c., will take place at GARRAWAY'S, on the first and last Tuesday of each month; a nominal charge made per lot to include all expenses.

THE INDEX, published Monthly, of Estates, Country and Town Houses, Shootings, &c., to be LET or SOLD, is issued free on application.—Auction and Estate Office, 25, Charles-street, St. James', London.

